

# The Classical Review

MARCH, 1918

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### THE SO-CALLED KOMMOS IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

THE choric part of Tragedy is classified by the author of chap. 12 of Aristotle's *Poetics* under the three heads: *Parodos*, *Stasimon*, and *Kommos*. A *Kommos* is defined as *θρήνος κοινὸς χοροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς*. As is well known, some of the definitions of technical terms in this chapter are so obviously irreconcilable with the facts of fifth-century drama that the authenticity of the whole chapter has been seriously suspected. We find, however, later grammarians adopting (with modifications) the definitions it contains; and it seems probable that the chapter was written by an early Peripatetic, if not by Aristotle himself. But, if we take it as genuine, we must also accept the view endorsed by Prof. Bywater, that 'the general assumption in the *Poetics* is the theatre as it was in the middle of the fourth century' (*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, 1909, p. 206), and take all the definitions in the chapter as applicable to Tragedy at that date, but not necessarily to fifth-century drama. This view would, perhaps, be generally admitted to be reasonable. What is certain, in any case, is that the definitions, taken as a whole, will not fit our three tragedians.

But, clear as this conclusion is, the term '*Kommos*' (with which alone this paper is concerned) is universally used by scholars to designate those passages in fifth-century Tragedy where the actors and the chorus recite and sing alternately—which are, in fact, *κοινὰ*

*χοροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς*, or (to adopt Westphal's word) *amoebaeae*. To this practice there would be no objection, if the word '*Kommos*' meant simply 'amoebaeae.' But '*Kommos*' means 'lamentation,' and in *Poetics* 12 it is defined not merely as *κοινὸς χοροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς*, but also as *θρήνος*.<sup>1</sup> Now, there are in extant Tragedy many passages which are amoebaeae, but are not *θρήνοι*; to these the name '*Kommos*' is inapplicable. There are also songs of lamentation which are not amoebaeae, but sung by the actors only or by the chorus only; to these the name '*Kommos*' is suitable, but not the definition in the *Poetics*.<sup>2</sup> There are obvious objections to using a term which means 'lamentation' to include passages which are not lamentations at all, and to exclude passages which are lamentations, but do not satisfy the other part of the definition.

I am not, however, merely quarrelling with the misuse of a technical term. In this name '*Kommos*' and its literal meaning, scholars have found support for theories which hold not only that the

<sup>1</sup> Faithful to Aristotle, Westphal insists on both parts of the definition, and refuses to recognise more than four *Kommoi* in Aeschylus' extant plays (*Proleg. z. Aesch. Trag.* 18); but other scholars are not so scrupulous.

<sup>2</sup> Thus the first *chorikon* (purely choral) of the *Choephori* is a *Threnos*, and moreover accompanied by τὸ κόπτεσθαι, l. 23 δέξχειρὶ σὺν κτύπῳ. πρέπει παρὴς φοίνισσ' ἀνυγμοῖς ὄνυχος ἰλοκε νεστόμῳ. Cf. Westphal, *Proleg. z. Aesch. Trag.* 18.

'Kommos' is the original kernel of Tragedy, as the *Parabasis* is held to be of Comedy, but also that the whole performance was originally a lamentation over a dead god or hero. It is, therefore, a question of no little importance what reason we have to think that Aeschylus or Sophocles or Euripides would have used the name 'Kommos' to describe the passages now so labelled in their plays. We have no evidence for its use as a term of dramatic technique before the middle of the fourth century.<sup>1</sup> At its first appearance in the *Poetics* it is defined in a way that presumably applies to contemporary drama, but certainly does not fit our three tragedians. We are clearly bound to look further into the facts before we use the meaning of this term to support any theory as to the origins of Tragedy.

We have to consider three classes of passages in fifth-century drama:

(1) Amoebaeon passages which are *Threnoi*, and so satisfy both the meaning and the definition of 'Kommos.'

(2) Amoebaeon passages which are not *Threnoi*, and so satisfy neither the meaning nor the definition.

(3) *Threnoi* which are not amoebaeon, and so satisfy the meaning, but not the definition.

The practice of scholars is to use the term 'Kommos' to denote classes (1) and (2), excluding (3). They regard, in fact, amoebaeon composition as the true test of a *Kommos*, neglecting that part of the definition which asserts that it is a *Threnos*. The practice is commonly justified in the only possible way by the conjecture that 'the *Kommos*' was originally an amoebaeon *Threnos*, but subsequently the amoebaeon form of composition was extended by the dramatists from lamentations (to which this form was appropriate in ordinary life) to cases where any violent emotion had to be expressed. Thus Masqueray, who has made a special study of the lyric forms in Greek Tragedy, remarks:<sup>2</sup> *Le Kommos est un thrène, c'est-à-dire un chant de deuil. Aristote les confond ensemble.*

<sup>1</sup> The phrase *ἐκοψα κομμὸν ἄριον* in Aesch. *Choeph.* 422 is, of course, no evidence for a technical use of the term.

<sup>2</sup> *Théorie des formes lyriques de la Tragédie grecque.* Paris, 1893, p. 17.

D'autres les ont distingués. On ne peut tirer aucun profit à les suivre. Le thrène, comme on le trouve dans Homère (*Il.* xxiv. 725-75) contenait des lamentations funèbres. Le *Kommos* tragique était, du moins à l'origine, un chant de douleur. . . .<sup>3</sup> Plus tard, son caractère se modifia, et il finit par être employé dès qu'une émotion violente s'emparait des acteurs ou des choréutes: la nature de cette émotion pouvait être très variée. Désespoir, tristesse, angoisse, sollicitude inquiète, passion tumultueuse. . . .<sup>4</sup> Some similar statement will be found in most handbooks on the Drama.<sup>4</sup>

The current view is, then, that amoebaeon composition was extended from *Threnoi* to other violent emotions—a view depending entirely on the supposition that the amoebaeon passages now labelled 'Kommoi' were so called in the fifth century. Our only means of checking this conjecture is to examine all the extant *Kommoi*, to see if this extension can be traced. If the view were true, we ought to find in the earliest tragedies amoebaeon composition solely or chiefly used for *Threnoi*, in the later tragedies more such compositions expressing other emotions and fewer of them restricted to *Threnoi*. The following table proves that the actual case is exactly the reverse. It shows all the passages classed as *Kommoi* in Masqueray's index<sup>5</sup> (*op.*

<sup>3</sup> 'L'étymologie du mot est donnée par Eschyle, *Choéphores*, 423: *ἐκοψα κομμὸν.*'

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Christ-Schmid, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* (1908) i. 263: 'Der Tragödie besonders eigen waren die Klagegesänge, *κομμοί* genannt von der bei Totenklagen üblichen Sitte, sich die Brust zu zerschlagen.' H. Weil, *Études sur le drame antique*, p. 5: 'Tout porte à croire que la lamentation était un élément constitutif de la tragédie primitive. On trouve partout dans Eschyle ce chant lugubre. . . . Plus tard, sans doute, l'antique lamentation ne revient pas dans toutes les pièces . . . mais le terme qui désignait ces lamentations, le nom de *κομμός*, reste attaché à tous les dialogues lyriques entre le chœur et les acteurs, et témoigne du caractère originel de ces morceaux.' Nilsson, in his admirable paper, 'Der Ursprung der Tragödie,' *N. Jahrb.* xxvii. (1911) 625, after pointing out that there are lamentations in Homer over still living heroes, continues: 'Die Tragödie hat also keine Neuerung eingeführt, als sie den Kommos in jeder grossen Gefahr und Angst anstimmen liess, auch wenn es sich nicht um einen Toten handelte.'

<sup>5</sup> The *Cyclops* is, of course, omitted, and also the *Alcestis*, which is not a tragedy.

## 'KOMMOI' IN EXTANT TRAGEDY.

## AESCHYLUS.

		Prevailing Emotion or Situation.
<i>Supplices</i>	347 Chorus and King 734 Danaos and Chorus 836 Herald threatening Chorus	Entreaty Terror Terror and Supplication
<i>Persae</i>	236 Messenger announces defeat: Chorus wail 694 Chorus and Ghost of Darius 922 Xerxes and Chorus	Quasi-Threnos Awe Threnos
<i>Septem</i>	203 Eteocles and Chorus terrified at sounds of war 686 Eteocles and Chorus	Terror and Prayer Expostulation and Entreaty
	874 Antigone, Ismene, and Chorus	Threnos
<i>Prometheus</i> <sup>1</sup>	1040 Prometheus, Hermes, and Chorus	Defiance and Threats
<i>Agamemnon</i>	1072 Chorus and Cassandra foreboding Agamemnon's death and her own 1448 Clytaemnestra: Chorus lamenting	Complaint Imperfect Threnos
<i>Choephoroi</i>	306 Orestes and Electra invoke Agam.	Quasi-Threnos
<i>Eumenides</i>	916 Athena and reconciled Eumenides	Joyful reconciliation
TOTALS	3 Threnoi (1 imperfect) 2 quasi-Threnoi 1 Complaint 7 [8] other emotions (1 joyful) 13 [14]	

## SOPHOCLES.

		Prevailing Emotion or Situation.
<i>Ajax</i>	201 Tekmessa tells Chorus of madness of Ajax 348 Ajax bewails his shame 879 Tekmessa announces death of Ajax	Grief and Fear Complaint Quasi-Threnos
<i>Antigone</i>	806 Antigone bewails her own death 1261 Kreon over the body of Haemon	Complaint Threnos
<i>Electra</i>	823 Electra after news of Orestes' death 1398 Electra and Chorus during murder of Clytaemnestra (whose cries are heard): Orestes and Pylades announce the murder	Quasi-Threnos Dialogue during and after murder
<i>Oedipus Rex</i>	649 Chorus and Oedipus; Chorus and Jocasta 1313 Oedipus bewails his blindness	Entreaty Complaint
<i>Trachiniae</i>	879 Nurse announces Deianeira's death	Quasi-Threnos
<i>Philoctetes</i>	1081 Philoctetes bewails the loss of the bow	Complaint

## SOPHOCLES—continued.

		Prevailing Emotion or Situation.
<i>Oedipus at Kolonos</i>	510 Oedipus recounts his misfortunes 833 } Oedipus, Kreon, and 876 } Chorus 1447 Oedipus, Antigone, and Chorus 1670 Antigone, Ismene, and Chorus	Complaint Expostulation Anxiety and Fear Threnos
TOTALS	2 Threnoi 3 quasi-Threnoi after death announced 1 dialogue during murder 5 Complaints 4 other emotions 15	

## EURIPIDES.

<i>Medea</i>	No κομμός	
<i>Andromache</i>	1197	Threnos
<i>Herakleidae</i>	No κομμός	
<i>Hippolytos</i>	569 Phaedra and Chorus 811 Theseus over Phaedra's body	Complaint Threnos
<i>Hecuba</i>	684 Hecuba over Polydorus	Threnos
<i>Herakles</i>	887 Amphitryon during murder of children: messenger announces it 1042 Amphitryon laments over Herakles	Quasi-Threnos Complaint (or quasi-Threnos?)
<i>Ion</i>	746 Chorus tell the oracle	Agitation, grief, etc.
<i>Supplices</i>	794 Adrastus and Chorus 1072 Iphis and Chorus 1114 Children and Chorus	Threnos Complaint Threnos
<i>Troades</i>	1216 Hecuba and Chorus 1287 Lament for Troy and Priam	Threnos Quasi-Threnos
<i>Electra</i>	1177 Electra and Orestes after murder of Clytaemnestra, lament their own sin, etc.	Complaint (or quasi-Threnos?)
<i>Helena</i>	330 Helen	Complaint
<i>Iphigeneia in Tauris</i>	643 Chorus condole with Orestes	Quasi-Complaint and Condolence
<i>Phoenissae</i>	1340 Kreon, messenger, and Chorus: announcement of death	Quasi-Threnos
<i>Orestes</i>	1246 Electra and Chorus during murder	Dialogue during murder.
<i>Iphigeneia at Aulis</i>	1475 Iphigeneia bewails her own death	Complaint
<i>Bacchae</i>	576 Dionysos and Chorus during earthquake 1031 Messenger announces death of Pentheus: Chorus exult 1168 Agave with head of Pentheus	Bacchic enthusiasm Inverted Threnos Inverted Threnos
<i>Rhesus</i>	No κομμός	
TOTALS	8 Threnoi (2 inverted) 3 quasi-Threnoi 7 Complaints (1 quasi-Complaint; 2 quasi-Threnoi) 1 dialogue during murder 2 other emotions 21	

<sup>1</sup> The final anapaests of the *Prometheus*, a play whose whole structure is unlike the other Aeschylean plays, ought not perhaps to be called a 'Kommos,' though the Chorus take part.

*cit.*, p. 307 ff.), with a short statement of the prevailing emotion or occasion. I use (1) *Threnos* to denote a regular lamentation over the actual death of some person in the play (including cases such as the final 'Kommos' of Xerxes and the Chorus in the *Persae*); (2) *quasi-Threnos*, for lamentations commemorative of a death that has occurred some time before<sup>1</sup> (e.g. the mourning of Electra and Orestes at Agamemnon's tomb in the *Choephori*), and passages where a death which has occurred off the stage is announced; (3) *Complaint*, where some character bewails his past troubles or future death. In this last case *θρήνος* has only a metaphorical application.<sup>2</sup>

This evidence tends to show that, so far from amoebaeon composition being extended from *Threnoi* to other emotions, it was used most freely by Aeschylus for any strong emotion likely to occur in Tragedy, including joy. Less than half of his 'Kommoi' are in any sense lamentations. In Sophocles the proportion is about two-thirds. In Euripides 18 out of 21 'Kommoi' are lamentations; only 3 instances being left for other emotions. Of these three, one (in the *Orestes*) is a dialogue during a murder off the stage, and so closely connected with a death; another is in our only Dionysiac play, the *Bacchae*, which in other respects too is exceptional, containing as it does two 'inverted *Threnoi*,' where the emotion is one of exultation, instead of mourning. The remaining instance is in a comparatively early play, the *Ion*. Though statistics based on the small selection of plays which survive are liable to error, the evidence seems to me strong enough to refute the conjecture—for it is nothing more—that amoebaeon com-

position was gradually extended from *Threnoi* to other violent emotions.

I am led to the following conclusions:

1. The author of *Poetics* 12 is defining in 'Kommos' a term which belongs to the theatre of the fourth century and to a date at which the tendency to limit amoebaeon composition to *Threnoi* had gone so far that the two were practically or absolutely coextensive. The choice of the word *κομμός* was probably dictated by the fact that *θρήνος* already denoted a particular class of lyric composition and was therefore better avoided for this purpose.<sup>3</sup>

2. It is extremely unlikely that Aeschylus used the term *κομμός* to denote amoebaeon passages, only a small proportion of which were in any sense lamentations. We have also no reason to think that either Sophocles or Euripides used the term, or indeed that it was current as a technical theatrical term in the great period of Tragedy.

3. No argument based on the meaning of the word 'Kommos' can lend the slightest support to any theory which holds that Tragedy was originally a lamentation for a dead god or man.

4. If it is true that we may see in the amoebaeon passages the original kernel of Tragedy, there is no reason to identify this with a *Threnos*. Amoebaeon composition is a type of composition that is not restricted to *Threnoi*, but naturally arises wherever a single performer has a distinct part in alternation with a chorus. The technical term for such a performer is *ἐξάρχων*, 'leader.' There

<sup>3</sup> Tzetzes, π. τραγ. ποιησ. 64, distinguishes between *κομμός* and *θρήνος*:

οὗτος δ' ὁ κομμός τοῦ χοροῦ τελῶν μέρος  
ὑποκριταῖς ἢ ὡς πολὺ συνηγμένος·  
κομμός δὲ θρήνου πενθικώτερον πλέον,  
ὁ θρήνος ἐστὶ δ' ἡμετέστερον μέρος.

He then quotes Aristotle's definition:

κομμὸν πάλιν ἄλλος δὲ τις θρήνον λέγει  
κοινὸν χοροῦ σκηνῆς τε τυγχάνειν λέγων,  
καὶ τὰλλα ταῦτά· τί πλατύνομεν λόγους;

From Eukleides' list of the parts of Tragedy (*ibid.*, 94 ff.) *κομμός* disappears, and τὸ ἀμοιβαῖον, ἢ ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς φῶδῃ takes its place. In another list (*ibid.*, 142) *κούρισμα* is substituted: *κούρισμα* δ' ᾧδῃ συμφορὰς πληρεστάτῃ | ταύτην ἀδόντων τὰς τρίχας κεκαρμένων. Others substituted the term *κομματικόν* (Pollux, IV. 53; Arg. Aesch. *Pers.*), which presumably means 'in bits' (*κόμματα*).

<sup>1</sup> If we follow Proclus (p. 321a B.), these cases will count as *θρήνοι*, for, in contrast with τὸ ἐπικηδεῖον = the lament over the body before burial, ὁ θρήνος οὐ περιγράφεται χρόνῳ. Eustath. on *Od.* 1673 limits *θρήνος* to a lamentation at the burial or at the annual festival of commemoration (πρὸ ταφῆς καὶ μετὰ ταφῆν καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαύσιον χρόνον τῆς κηδείας), and contrasts with it ὁ ἐπικηδεῖος λόγος, the speech of encomium (ἔπαινος τοῦ τελευτήσαντος) which belongs to later rhetoric.

<sup>2</sup> *Agam.* 1321 *Kassandra*: ἀπαξ ἔρ' εἰπείν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον θέλω | ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς.



is an *exarchon* in the round dance on the Shield of Achilles (*Il.* xviii. 606 *μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντος*); in the Marching Paean sung by the Spartan king and his army (*Plut. Lyc.* 22 ἅμα δὲ ἐξήρχεν (ὁ βασιλεὺς) ἐμβατηρίου παιᾶνος); in the Song of Archilochos, led by the Olympic victor at the head of the κῶμος of his companions;<sup>1</sup> and finally in the Dithyramb, from whose ἐξάρχοντες Aristotle says that Tragedy arose (*Poet.* 4).<sup>2</sup> The amoebaeon passages

in Tragedy are probably survivals of a form of dithyramb which existed before 'Tragedy' took the shape we know, and of which we may have another survival in the dialogue Dithyramb of Bacchylides (xvii).

Modern scholars would, I think, be well advised to give up calling amoebaeon passages in fifth-century drama by the name 'Kommoi.'

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge, November, 1912.

<sup>1</sup> Pind. *Ol.* IX. 1 τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος . . . ἀρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεύσαι κωμάζοντι φίλους Ἐφαρμόστω σὺν ἑταίροις. Christ (*ad loc.*), *Victor vero ipse vice praecentoris (ἐξάρχου) fungebatur sodalibus praecuntis, id quod Pindarus verbo ἀγεμονεύσαι significavit et scholiasta hac adnotatione confirmat*: κωμάζει δὲ πρὸς τὸν τοῦ Διὸς θωμόν ὁ νικήσας μετὰ τῶν φίλων, αὐτὸς τῆς φθῆς ἐξηγούμενος. See J. E. Harrison, *Themis* (1912), p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot agree with Prof. Bywater's note on this passage (*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, 1909, p. 134), where he says that Aristotle

means by ἐξάρχων the 'poet-composer,' and that 'ἐξάρχειν διθύραμβον' is practically a synonym for διδάσκειν διθύραμβον.' The part of ἐξάρχων might be taken by the poet-composer, but the word, beyond all question, means 'leader'; and Aristotle's point is that Tragedy arose from a certain lyrical form in which there was a distinct part performed by a 'leader' or leaders, not that it arose from a form which (like other forms of poetry) had a 'poet-composer.' For the ἐξάρχων cf. E. Reisch, *Zur Vorgeschichte d. att. Tragödie in Festschr. f. Th. Gomperz*, 1902, p. 451 ff.

### THE DRAGGING OF HECTOR.

VIRGIL says that Achilles—

ter circum Iliacos raptaverat Hectora muros, and such was the tradition known to Euripides (*Andromache*, v. 107). As we know, Homer makes Achilles chase the living Hector thrice round the walls, and drag the corpse to the Grecian camp, subsequently dragging it thrice round the tomb of Patroclus each day for three days. The triple dragging round the walls, the triple chasing round the walls, the triple dragging round the tomb—all three evidently are not each of independent origin, and we have to inquire which is likely to be the original.

Recalling the sevenfold encompassment of Jericho, I thought it might be possible to find some evidence that the triple chasing round the walls was a magic act which would break the spell of Troy's inexpugnability, but the best authorities (Mr. Crooke and Mr. Hartland) know of nothing of the kind. Nor is there any evidence that this spell was ever broken, except of course by the Trojans themselves taking down the wall to admit the wooden horse. It is

indeed most doubtful if in the original legend of the tale of Troy the city did fall—if its magic seal, *ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα*, was ever broken!<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, the triple encompassment of a corpse or a tomb is a world-wide rite. It is no use my citing instances,<sup>2</sup> and this is not the place for a discussion of its meaning. The dragging round the tomb is then, it would seem, the original version; but whence the dragging round the walls, and the chasing round the walls? The former would seem to be a brutal variant of the dragging round the tomb. The body of Hector (and in the original version it was before death) would thus pass immediately under the eyes of his wife

<sup>1</sup> From the use of the word *λύειν* I think the metaphor in *ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα λύμεν* is taken from the seal of a jar. *κρήδεμνα* (from *κᾶρα* and *δεῖν*) is the cloth put over the mouth of a jar and sealed (*Odys.* III. 392). It is wrongly taken by later poets (e.g. Euripides) to mean 'battlements.' The meaning of many other words, which had not survived in common parlance, has been similarly distorted.

<sup>2</sup> See *Burial* in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia*.

and relatives, and Achilles must have done it to inflict additional pain on them. Homer, with his humane tendency, would have suppressed this and substituted the chase round the walls. But this does not explain the *ter*;<sup>1</sup> once would surely have sufficed.

I think the solution of the difficulty is as follows. As I pointed out in a previous article (above p. 3), Homer is obviously following a source in which the recovery of Achilles' magic armour is the chief motive for his issuing to meet Hector, the motive of vengeance for the death of Patroclus being subordinate (see *Addendum*). In this source the body of Patroclus was not recovered. It was, as Hector threatens, in Troy, being eaten by dogs and the head on a stake. Troy was inexpugnable, and the only honour Achilles could pay to the dead, the only means he had of laying the ghost, was to drag Hector's body thrice round Troy, where the body was. Homer had fixed the *μῆνις* of Achilles as the subject of his poem and had decided not to carry it on to the death of Achilles, but in his material he had the death of Achilles, he had the famous fight over his body which Ulysses in the Odyssey (V. 310) when he is drowning remembers as the hottest fight he was ever in, he had the burial of Achilles and the games at his funeral. Just as at the outset of his poem by the device of the *μῆνις* (see *Addendum*) he gets in a large body of material belonging to the opening of the war, so he here gets in all this material relating to the death of Achilles by the devices, of saving the body of Patroclus. They are both most admirable devices, worthy of the great poet he was. That the fight over the body of Patroclus is an echo of that over the body of Achilles, seems obvious from the little we know of the latter. In this fight which led up to the *δῖων κρίσις* between Ulysses and Ajax, a part of the story doubtless pre-Homeric (see above p. 3), the leading parts were taken by these two heroes. There is a difference in our

authorities (Schol. ad Aristoph. *Eq.* 1056 = Kinkel *Ep. Fr.*, p. 39, and Schol. ad *Odys.* V. 309) about the respective parts they played, but everything tends to show that Ajax, who was the bigger man, carried the body (here unstripped), while Ulysses defended him in the rear. This was the version of the little *Iliad* at least. The scholiast to Homer reverses their positions. In the *Iliad* the two Ajaxes defend the rear, while the body (here stripped) is carried off by Menelaus and Meriones (*Il.* XVII. 715 sq.). Homer, of course, could not be quite servile, as he was copying a well-known incident in which Ulysses figured, but he kept Ajax (and his double) reversing his position, not to the advantage of probability. This refers to the end of the fight over the body. How much in the rest of this long fight is adapted from the fight over the body of Achilles, and how much is Homer's invention or adapted from his direct source, we have no means of telling, but at the beginning of it there is no apparent reason why Hector should not have carried off the body as well as the armour. This, as I say, I conjecture he did, and very likely the magic horses too, in Homer's direct source for the death of Patroclus and Hector. The facts that the chariot and horses are not at once withdrawn after Hector's final attempt on them, that Automedon afterwards drives them back into the thick of the fight, thus giving Hector another chance of capturing them, and that, having remained on the field, they are not used to carry off the body, seem to me at least very difficult to explain. They point, I think, to not very finished adaptation from a divergent narrative. As regards the chasing round the walls one can only suppose that Homer substituted it for the dragging, which the plan of his poem excluded.

#### ADDENDUM.

I find on referring to Cauer's *Grundfragen*, Edition II., that some others share the convictions I had formed that the close intimacy of Achilles and Patroclus is an invention of Homer, and I see I have quite a phalanx of support in my belief that the *μῆνις* is also an invention of Homer's. But as I think I

<sup>1</sup> No one, I suppose, would maintain that this is a blunder of Virgil's, who confused a single dragging round the walls—non-Homeric—with the Homeric triple dragging round the tomb.

established (above, p. 3) that the story of the loan and loss of the armour is pre-Homeric, another legendary motive must be found for Achilles' refusal to take part personally in the siege. This motive can only be the very one that Homer makes him repudiate (*Il.* XVI, 50). Achilles had taken twelve island cities and eleven on the mainland. But there was a ban against his taking the twelfth, Troy herself the enchanted city, and he knew that even if he warred against her, it condemned him to imminent death. He did his best by lending his magic armour, and horses, and his troops, with the result we know.

He lent them, not to one of his own people, but to a Locrian, Patroclus; why to him we do not know. There is thus, naturally, not trace in the *Iliad* of Achilles ever having fought against Troy: his famous exploits were all in the country. Of course, by the introduction of the motive of the *μήνις*, Homer tacitly assumes and makes us think that Achilles withdrew his participation in the actual siege, but this is part of Homer's art. It is just these creations of his, the wrath and the love of Achilles, which make the *Iliad* what it is.

W. R. PATON.

### SATYRUS' LIFE OF EURIPIDES.

THE Text appears in the last volume (IX.) of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, edited by Dr. Hunt. The MS. is somewhat inaccurate as well as lamentably imperfect. In the following notes dots represent missing letters, and [ ] conjectural restorations, which I have only indicated when necessary.

Fragm. 8. 17 (quotation from Aris- toph.) δι' ἧς τὰ λεπτά ῥήματ' [ἐξέσ]- μήχετο, said of Eur.'s tongue. ἐκμή- χομαι seems an unsuitable word and the μ is uncertain. Some compound of νήχομαι, e.g. εἰσενήχετο, may be conjectured. Cf. 39. XX. below quoted.

Fr. 38. III. 15 (quotation)

θύραθεν οὐ θέλοιμ' ἂν ἐλθοῦσαν μακρὰν χρυσὸν παρ' Ἰστρον οὐδὲ Βόσπορον λαβῶν.

I thought first of

θύραθεν οὐ θέλοιμ' ἂν ἐλθοῦσ' ἂν μακρὰν χρυσὸν παρ' Ἰστρον οὐδὲ Βόσπορον λαβεῖν.

But, though ἐλθοῦσ' ἂν θέλοιμ' ἂν would be right enough, the reverse order is at least very unusual. Read then

θύραθεν οὐ παρ' Ἰστρον ἐλθοῦσ' ἂν μακρὰν χρυσὸν θέλοιμ' ἂν οὐδὲ Βόσπορον λαβεῖν.

An impulse to bring παρ' Ἰστρον and Βόσπορον together has led to error. The lady does not desire gold, if she has to go for it to the Black Sea.

Fr. 39. IV. 8 (quotation)

λέγοντες οὐ πονήρ' ἀπαλοῖς δὲ χρώμενοι . . . αλ . . . δεχρῶ . . . . .

which Hunt turns into

λέγοντες οὐ πονήρ' ἀπαλοῖς δὲ χρώμενοι,

(Wilamowitz - Moellendorff ἀπάτη δὲ χρώμεθα or χρωμένον.) I suggest λέγον- τες οὐ πονηρά, μάλα δὲ χρώμενοι.

Ib. V. 12 (quotation).

Perhaps we should punctuate and read thus:

A. ἐν ταῖς τριόδοις σοι προσγελῶσ' αὐλη- τρίδες

τοὺς ἀστυνόμους. B. τίνες εἰσί; A. πυν- θάνη; [κα]λοί.

B. τοὺς π[τερο]κοποῦντας τὴν ἐλευ- θερίαν λέγεις.

Hunt π[τερο]κοποῦντας, but there seem to be five letters missing, and πτεροκοπῶ has the advantage of being a known word. He also puts the stop after αὐλητρίδες, but προσγελῶ usually takes an accusative. On astynomi and flute-girls cf. (Arist.) Ἀθ. Πολ. 50. 2. καλοί is my own-guess. Perhaps the third line should be a question.

Ib. VIII. 11 ἀπόκρισιν for ὑπόκρισιν?

Ib. IX. 27 (quotation). Both usage and metre point to τοιοῦτος in place of τοῖος.

Ib. X. 20 (ὑπὸ Κλέωνος) δίκην ἔφυγεν. Rather ἔφευγεν he was prosecuted than ἔφυγεν he was acquitted.

*Ib.* XX. 7 'ποῖον δὲ στόμα τοιοῦτο γέγονεν, ἢ γένοιτ' ἂν ἥδιον δι' οὗ γε δὴ τοιαῦτα μέλη γε καὶ ἔπη διαπορεύεται;' (Δι.) ὁμοίως οὗτος, καθάπερ εἴρηκας δαιμονίως ἐν τῷ . . . ακοτι πρὸς τὸν ποιητήν.

So Dr. Hunt, who translates 'what mouth has there been such or could be sweeter than that from which proceed songs and words like his. (Di) He resembled the man who . . . to the poet, as you have admirably said in . . .' Read however τοιοῦτου, governed by ἥδιον and explained, as it so often is, by the relative pronoun, δι' οὗ. The comma should therefore follow ἥδιον, not γέγονεν. I think the meaning of the rest is also missed. In εντωι the ω and ι are by no means certain (Dr. Hunt tells me), and I therefore suggest ὁμοίως οὗτος, καθάπερ εἴρηκας, δαιμονίως ἐντεθουσιακότι πρὸς τὸν ποιητήν. οὗτος is the man from whom ποῖον δὲ κ.τ.λ. is quoted. Dr. Hunt (without committing himself to my suggestion) thinks there is room for the letters of ἐντεθουσιακότι. ὁμοίως=ἔοικε with dative, seems to be; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 376B.

For πρὸς we should rather expect περί.

I append a few other notes.

Fr. 38. II. 8 (quotation)

ὄτῳ πάρεστιν τὸ πονεῖν τό τ' ἀγαθὸν κεκληῖσθαι φίλος ὧν ἐμὸς λεγέσθω. 'Let the man who works and who is known to be the friend of the good be called my friend' (Hunt). I think ἀγαθὸν is partitive, a good man. φίλος ὧν=φίλος εἶναι, like *Philebus* 22 Ε μετόν . . . λέγοιτο, *Soph. El.* 676 θανόντ' Ὀρέστην νῦν τε καὶ πάλοι λέγω, etc.

*Ib.* IV. 33 αὐτόν seems to be Socrates, not Euripides.

Fr. 39. VI. 15 After πατρί put a comma only. What precedes is what φαίη ἂν τις.

*Ib.* VII. 17 τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν νέαν κωμῳδίαν are the things, not which 'comprise,' but which make up the New Comedy, its chief elements.

*Ib.* IX. 15 ἀπλῶς with ἅπαν, not with the participles.

*Ib.* XIX. 8 Μακεδόνων . . . ὕστερον ἥσθοντο, learned, not later from the Macedonians, but later than they.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

### PASSING UNDER THE YOKE.

In ancient Italy, when an army surrendered in the field, there were three alternatives before the victors for dealing with the vanquished. First, they might put them to death; there was nothing to prevent this but the feeling and tradition among Italian peoples in historical times against unnecessary bloodshed.<sup>1</sup> (See Livy ix. 3, both for the legality of the practice and the feeling against it). Secondly, they might keep them as prisoners of war, and sell them as slaves; but in early times this was practically out of the question, partly owing to the difficulty of feeding and guarding them before they were sold, and partly because the machinery of sale had not then been invented—there were neither slave agents at hand, nor slave-markets in the cities. Thirdly, they might let their captives go free,

with or without imposing conditions on them to be ratified by their State. This was really the simplest and easiest plan, and was adopted in the few cases recorded by Livy in which whole armies were captured (*i.e.* in iii. 28, ix. 6, and x. 36). But before the vanquished were dismissed, they were made to go through the ceremony of passing under the yoke (*sub iugum missi*), which Livy, when he first mentions it (iii. 28, Roman victory over Aequi), explains as a kind of dramatised form of degradation. Two spears were fixed upright in the ground, and a third was fastened horizontally by each end to the tops of them; under this extemporised arch the conquered army had to pass, disarmed, and apparently wearing nothing but an under-garment (*tunica*), or the older *subligaculum*, the dress rather of slaves than of soldiers or citizens. Livy's language is explicit: 'ut exprimatur confessio subactam

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Phillipson, *International Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*, vol. ii. p. 253 ff.



domitamque esse gentem.' It is possible of course that this is the true explanation, and in any case it is likely that in historical times this was the commonly received view. But there is some reason to believe that the passage under the yoke originally had another object and meaning. In the second edition of his *Golden Bough*, vol. iii. p. 406, Dr. Frazer, after collecting a number of practices in which human beings or animals are passed through a space limited in some way on either side, suggests in a footnote that the passage under the yoke may have been 'a purificatory ceremony, designed to strip the foe of his malignant and hostile powers before dismissing him to his home.' The reader who wishes to grasp the full force of this suggestion should study the examples given in the eight or ten pages preceding this footnote. It is however desirable to find, if possible, analogous usages on Italian or Roman soil before finally accepting Dr. Frazer's suggestion.

This, I think, is not impossible. There were two objects in Rome itself which may be compared with the *iugum*: 1, the *tigillum sororium*, as it was called, and 2, the *porta triumphalis*.

On the steep slope of the Carinae, just above the hollow where the Coliseum now stands,<sup>1</sup> there was a small street called the *vicus Cuprius*: and where it was crossed by another (*ad compitum Acili*), a beam (*tigillum*) stretched from one side of the street to the other, called the *tigillum sororium*. Festus, p. 297, tells us that this had originally rested upon two other beams, like the spear under which the captured army passed; and that it was set up in this manner by the father of Horatius, who in the legend had murdered his sister, after his acquittal by the people, and after certain sacrifices to Janus Curiatius and Juno Sororia, whose altars remained there to the latest age of Roman history.<sup>2</sup> But what was the

object of this beam? Livy, Festus, and Dionysius all agree that Horatius was made to pass under it, *velut sub iugum missus*, as an *expiatio* for the crime he had committed. His acquittal by the people was not enough; he was not, by that method of procedure, 'liberatus omni noxia sceleris' (Festus). Something had yet to be done in order to make him fit to mingle with his fellow-citizens, and what was done was of a religious character. He is represented as having his head covered, which is a sure sign of this, even if we cannot trust the tradition about the two altars below the beam. He passed under the beam, *velut sub iugum missus*, and was then clear of all *scelus*, with the approval of the augurs.

I have used the Latin word *scelus*, not wishing to commit myself to the notion that the thing thus got rid of was *moral* guilt; had it been that, our modern minds would naturally suppose that it was wiped away by the acquittal. Far from it; the sister's blood had been shed, and no lay court could possibly get rid of that stain. Horatius was undoubtedly *sacer*, i.e. taboo, in an infectious condition, dangerous to society.<sup>3</sup> But in this peculiar form of passage under an arch or *iugum*, the religious authorities were able to apply a method of disinfection, which in the language of a later age is naturally spoken of as *expiatio* or purification.

The second object in Rome which may be compared to the *iugum* was the *porta triumphalis*. A victorious army, before entering the city, had to pass under a gateway or arch which was called by this name. Its exact position we do not know for certain, but it is quite clear from a passage in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* 7. 5. 4.) that it was in the Campus Martius, i.e. that it was an archway standing by itself outside the

<sup>1</sup> The best account of the position is in Hülsen-Jordan, *Röm. Topographie*, I. iii. 322 ff.; where also the texts relating to the *tigillum* are quoted in full (Liv. i. 26; Festus, p. 297; and Dionys. III. 22. 7).

<sup>2</sup> *Act. de viris illustribus*, iii. 4. It is singular that the *tigillum* itself seems to have been

the object of worship: the *Fasti Arvales* have a note on Oct. 1, 'tigillo sororio ad compitum Acili.' Henzen, *Acta Frat. Arv.*, p. ccxxviii. Pais, *Storia di Roma*, i. 298-9, gets out of his depth in speculating on these worships and their connexion with the gens Horatia. My own opinion on these puzzling points is expressed in my *Roman Festivals*, p. 237 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See the *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. i., p. 58 ff., and my *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 28.

walls, and it is probable that it was close to the famous ara Martis, but separated from it by the stream called Petronia amnis, which had a religious importance of its own.<sup>1</sup> We may suppose that in ancient times the army was lustrated in *campo*, near the ara Martis, and that it then crossed the sacred stream and passed under the *porta triumphalis*. What this was like we do not know; neither description nor representation of it survives. But I may conjecture that it was not wholly unlike the oldest triumphal arch surviving, that of Augustus at Rimini (Ariminum). There can hardly be a doubt that when triumphal arches were first introduced as ornamental memorials of some achievement, they took the form of the old *porta triumphalis* familiar to Roman soldiers, and that a more elaborate style of ornamentation was only gradually developed. Now if we look at the arch at Ariminum (of which there is a cut handy in the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, s.v. *arcus triumphalis*), we shall notice that the most striking part of the arch consists of two upright Corinthian pillars with an architrave laid across them: within this is an arch proper built on the usual plan.<sup>2</sup> I hope I am not too fanciful in suggesting that we have here a reminiscence of the *tigillum* resting on two upright *tigilla*, and of the two spears of the *ingum* supporting a third spear. This was in fact almost the very oldest form of gateway, as one sees in the Lion gate at Mycenae, and thus a course of development can be traced from two upright beams or stones, with a third laid across them, to the most elaborately decorated archways of the Roman emperors.

Now is there any common idea in the use of these three arches (or whatever we choose to call them)—the *ingum*, the *tigillum*, and the *porta triumphalis*?

<sup>1</sup> See Hülsen-Jordan, *op. cit.*, I. iii. 494 and *reff.*; also Domaszewski, *Abhandlungen zur Röm. Religion*, p. 222 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.*, my idea is that the Greek ornamentation, as it is usually called, the pillars and architrave, were really an ornamented form of the old wooden gate or arch. This is seen well in the old Roman gate of Thessalonica, figured in Schreiber, *Atlas of Classical Antiquities*, Pl. 50. See *Companion to Latin Studies*, p. 522.

Let us compare the objects in the three cases, so far as they can be made out.

The object is clearest in the case of Horatius. He had to be cleansed from something dangerous and infectious, and the consummation of this cleansing is signified by his passage under an object which formed a limit between the region of the *sacrum* and that of the *profanum*: he could not mingle with his fellow-citizens if he were *sacer*, but the sacrifices and the passage under the *tigillum* effectually rid him of this burden. It was what M. van Gennep has called a 'rite de passage,' and may safely be compared with those in which a human being passes through some divided object as a cleft tree, or between two posts, in order to get rid of some disease or other trouble.<sup>3</sup>

The passage through the *porta triumphalis* may well have had the same meaning originally. The army was guilty of bloodshed, like Horatius, and had been moving about in places where there were strange beings, human and spiritual, with whom it would be unsafe to come in contact—unsafe not only for the soldiers themselves, but for the citizens to whom they might communicate the infection on their return. Even if we cannot exactly say that the returning host was *sacer*, we know that it needed *lustratio*, and that it underwent this process immediately before passing through the *porta*: which was exactly what happened to Horatius, according to the story.

Lastly, let us return to the *ingum* of the three spears. I think we are now justified in assuming that there was a religious or magical element in this degrading ceremony:<sup>4</sup> apart from the

<sup>3</sup> See Van Gennep, *Rites de Passage*, chap. ii. p. 19 ff.; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd edition, vol. iii. p. 400 ff. The examples given on p. 401 from Kamskatka are specially interesting.

<sup>4</sup> This was originally suggested by Roscher in article 'Ianus' in his *Mythological Lexicon* (vol. ii. p. 21) with reference to the *tigillum sororium*. He quoted Grimm for a case of squeezing oneself through a split tree to get rid of some disease. This is practically the same kind of explanation as Dr. Frazer has applied to the passage under the yoke. I may just add that in my own village of Kingham I have known an intelligent man carry his child

'rites de passage' collected by Dr. Frazer, the *tigillum sororium* strongly suggests it, and plainly reminded the Romans, as we saw, of the *iugum*. And the passage through the *porta triumphalis*, though it is the passage of a victorious and not a surrendered army, had beyond doubt a religious or magical meaning, which should suggest an analogous one in the case of the *iugum*. Still there is a difficulty. What can have been the object of subjecting the captives to the same kind of ceremony as the murderer, or the victorious host? Dr. Frazer thinks that it was to deprive them 'of their malignant and hostile

powers' before sending them home. I do not see that we can find a better explanation, though I might put it somewhat differently. They had to be brought out of one status into another; they must not be any longer the same beings they were before the *deditio*; just as in historical times the *dediticius* passed out of his former status into a new one, and became absorbed in the body politic of the conqueror, to be henceforward harmless. But it is hard to express the conception lying at the root of these practices, however strongly we may be convinced that we feel or understand it. I will leave it to experts in primitive culture.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

*Kingham, Chipping Norton, Oxon.*

seven times across a bridge to get rid of the whooping-cough—which is probably a reminiscence of the same notion.

## NOTES

EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, ll. 898-901.

ΑΓ. ἔσται τάδ' οὕτω· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἦν  
στρατῶ  
πλοῦς, οὐκ ἂν εἶχον τήνδε σοι δοῦναι  
χάριν·  
νῦν δ', οὐ γὰρ ἔησ' οὐρίας πνοῆς θεός,  
μένειν ἀνάγκη πλοῦν ὀρώντας ἥσυχον.

THIS passage, taken in conjunction with what has gone before in the play, affords, I think, a very good illustration and, as far as it goes, a confirmation of the late Dr. Verrall's well-known theory of the critical and satirical purpose underlying much of Euripides' treatment of the Greek legends in their religious and moral aspects. The sacrifice of Polyxena has been demanded by the shade of Achilles, who is detaining the Greek fleet on its way back from Troy at the Thracian Chersonese, and performed by his son, praying that Achilles may come to drink 'a maiden's dark pure blood' and grant the Greeks favourable winds. To the human and pathetic side of the situation and to the dignity and courage of the virgin-martyr Euripides does full justice, as is his wont, in his exquisite treatment. Then later, when Hecuba is begging Agamemnon to help her in exacting

vengeance for the murder of Polydorus, comes this disconcerting remark of the King's, put in quietly and unobtrusively, just as suits the conditions postulated by Dr. Verrall's theory. After all the horror perpetrated and witnessed by the Greeks they are just as much dependent as ever, it seems, on the vagaries of the weather!

W. J. GOODRICH.

*Bradford Grammar School.*

## A GREEK PROVERB.

LIDDELL and Scott, s.v. ὄρισμα, say 'Proverb. Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα, of disputed points, Plut. 2. 122 C.' A reference, however, to the passage shows that this is not so. An indignant physician is there represented as approaching a couple of philosophers, βοῶν ἐτι πρόσωθεν οὐ μικρὸν οὐδ' ἐπικεκῆς ἔργον ἡμῖν σύγχυσιν ὄρων τετολμησθαι, διαλεχθεῖσι περὶ διαίτης ὑγιεινῆς. 'Χωρίς' γὰρ ἔφη τὰ φιλοσόφων καὶ ἱατρῶν ὥσπερ τινῶν 'Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα,' κ.τ.λ. Here the meaning is obviously that the doctor and the philosopher have different provinces and jurisdictions, and that neither should trespass upon those of the other. On the other hand,

Strabo, xii. 8. 2. p. 571, after stating that there has been considerable geographical confusion in these parts, concludes, ὥσθ' ὅπερ ἔφην ἔργον διορίσαι 'χωρὶς τὰ Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα,' which supports the statement of L. Sc. This apparent contradiction is explained by another passage in Strabo (xii. 4. 4. p. 564), which shows that the proverb could be used in both senses. διορίσαι δὲ τοὺς ὅρους χαλεπὸν τοὺς τε Βιθυνῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν καὶ Μυσῶν καὶ ἔτι . . . καὶ διότι μὲν εἶναι δεῖ ἕκαστον φύλον χωρὶς ὁμολογεῖται (καὶ ἐπὶ γε τῶν Φρυγῶν καὶ τῶν Μυσῶν καὶ παροιμάζονται 'χωρὶς τὰ Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα') διορίσαι δὲ χαλεπὸν. To these passages may be added, χωρὶς τὰ φιλοσόφων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἱερέων ὀρίσματα, οὐδὲν ἦττον ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ὁ Πατρίκιος ἐτόλμησε, παρὰ νόμον τὸν φιλοσοφίας, ἐπὶ ταῦτα ῥυεῖς (Damasc. Vita Isidori, § 132).

HERBERT W. GREENE.

4, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

#### JURAIURANDA ET PERSONAE MENANDREAE.

A RECENT reviewer (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXI. 329) of my *Studies in Menander* has taken me to task for failing to note a fondness of certain of Menander's characters for certain oaths. I append a list of the oaths used by the several personages in the three important plays, and leave the reader to judge whether such supposed fondness be not more or less fanciful.

*Epitrepontes*: Onesimus servus: By the gods collectively, 183, 224, 458, 503 (?); Apollo, 183, 457, 503; Zeus, 486; Helios, 308; Heracles, 315, 542. Smicrines senex: By the gods collectively, 543; Zeus, 138. Syrus servus: By the gods collectively, 6, 15, 179; Apollo, 179. Davus servus: By Zeus, 142; Heracles, 146, 155. Habrotonon meretrix: By the gods collectively, 267, 272, 331; Aphrodite, 263; Demeter, 507; Two goddesses, 326.

*Samia*: Demeas senex: By the gods collectively, 57, 220; Twelve gods, 91; Apollo, 222, 225, 251; Zeus, 203; Helios, 108; Heracles, 207; Hephaestus, 207. Parmenon servus: By the gods

collectively, 88, 107; Apollo, 94; Asclepius, 95; Dionysus, 94; Zeus, 95, 296, 335. Coquus: By the gods collectively, 71; Heracles, 145; Poseidon, 148. Moschion adulescens: By Dionysus, 323; Zeus, 341. Niceratus senex: By Heracles, 190, 193.

*Periceirromene*: Polemon miles: By the gods collectively, 267, 401; Athena, 569 K. (?); Apollo, 440; Demeter, 255; Zeus, 417, 569 K. (?). Sosias servus: By the gods collectively, 185. Glycera virgo: By the gods collectively, 377. Doris ancilla: By Aphrodite, 413. Davus servus: By Apollo, 138; Asclepius, 146; Zeus, 127, 149, 190; Heracles, 162. Moschion adulescens: By the gods collectively, 397, 448; Athena, 113; Gê, 448; Zeus, 336. Pataecus senex: By the gods collectively, 329; Zeus, 274, 313; Poseidon, 268. Habrotonon meretrix: By the gods collectively, 231.

F. WARREN WRIGHT.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.

#### ENCLITICS AT THE CAESURA.

To the list given in *Classical Review* xxvi., p. 183, may now perhaps be added Sophocles, *Ichneutae* 108 οὐκ εἰσακούω πω, which Dr. Hunt accepts in his edition of *Fragmenta Tragica Papyracea*. And in Euripides, *Hypsipyle*, Fr. 34, 99, he gives ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ τοι χρόνον as a conjectural restoration.

J. U. POWELL.

#### A NOTE ON THE POETICAL USE OF THE GERUNDIVE.

AN examination of Ovid's use of the gerund and gerundive with past tenses of the verb 'esse,' equivalent in sense to a jussive in past time, reveals an interesting distinction between the meanings of the past and imperfect tenses. The past is used to express obligation in the complete past, incapable now of discharge; the imperfect to express obligation in the present, equally of course incapable of discharge. The use of *possum* with the infinitive, instead of a potential subjunctive, follows the same rule. The use of the past, as above described, is natural and obvious to the most casual reader,



but the use of the imperfect is by no means so obviously natural, though not unreasonable in view of the regular use of the potential imperfect subjunctive referring to present time.

The following quotations, a practically exhaustive collection of those uses of the gerundive relevant to this discussion, from the *Heroides*, seem to establish the point beyond question.

- a. *Her.* 1. 108. Nunc erat auxiliis illa tuenda tuis.
- b. " 2. 28. Crimine te potui demeruisse meo.
- c. " 2. 54. Parte satis potui qualibet inde capi.
- d. " 2. 60. Dum potui Phyllis honesta mori.
- e. " 2. 137. Non tibi sic, dices, Phylli, sequendus eram.
- f. " 3. 13. Differri potui: poenae mora grata fuisset.
- g. " 5. 134. At manet Oenone fallenti casta marito: et poteris falli legibus ipse tuis.
- h. " 6. 54. Milite tam forti causa tuenda fuit.
- i. " 7. 143. Pergama vix tanto tibi erant repetenda labore, Hectore si vivo quanta fuere, forent.
- k. " 9. 69. Si te vidisset cultu Busiris in isto, victori victo nempe pudendus erat.
- l. " 10. 112. Aut semel aeterna nocte pre-menda fui.
- m. " 12. 5. Tum potui Medea mori bene.
- n. " 14. 61. An meruere necem patruelia regna petendo Quae tamen externis praedia danda forent?

#### Contrast

- o. *Her.* 10. 107. Non poterant figi praecordia ferrea cornu,

which is an example of the ordinary prose use, without any similarity to *g*, etc.

None of these quotations call for any remark, except perhaps *e*, where present obligation makes better sense than past, *g*, where the present of the first line definitely supports my view, *i*, where the potential *forent* again supports me, *k*, where the present is perhaps less natural, but certainly not impossible, *n*, which is very difficult, and probably to be classed with *o*, as not really belonging to this usage.

It would be interesting to find whether this distinction is universal or only confined to Ovid. In practical work I have often found it a stumbling-block to the unwary.

C. H. BROADBENT.

#### THE MANUSCRIPT PROBLEM IN THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.

(*Classical Review*, xvii. 344 sqq.)

A REFERENCE to what has already appeared in this Journal would have been of use to Mr. H. W. Garrod and his readers when he put forward the hardy theory that appeared in the number for December, p. 263. If he has been misled by the ill-advised reticence (to give it no harsher name) of the editor of the Oxford text, a similar reference to *C. R.* xx. 318 would have saved him. His views upon the latter question Mr. Garrod may be left to re-adjust for himself; but upon the first matter, for the sake of English scholarship, a word of protest is needed.

I contended in 1903 and Mr. Phillimore in 1904 that the MS which Politian examined for his excerpts in 1494 and which he says Poggio had brought 'ex Gallia' could not be the *Matritensis*. Mr. Garrod recurs to the view that it was. Arguing against the theory that Politian's codex was the original Gallic (or Swiss) manuscript brought by Poggio to Italy, Mr. Garrod asks:

How comes it that the collation of the great Politian himself differs only in a few letters and nowhere in any point of importance from the copy given to us by our 'ignorantissimus omnium uiuentium'? Is it credible that this 'ignorantissimus' should have made a transcript of the archetype agreeing in almost every letter with that made by Politian? It is, of course, wholly incredible.

Not so wholly incredible as that this should have been written for the *Classical Review*. Politian made no 'transcript' of his MS; not even a 'collation' of it in any sense that will help Mr. Garrod's argument. What he did was to copy *excerpts* therefrom upon the pages of a printed text; nor is there anything in these excerpts which such an expert as he might not have got just as well from the ancient exemplar as from the faithful, though stupid, copy. Show us from the excerpts but half a score of corruptions which are the singular and private property of the *Matritensis*, and the matter will wear a very different complexion.

Mr. Garrod is bent on making the *Matritensis* our sole authority for the text of the *Siluae*. But the Excerpts stand in the way, presenting, *inter alia*, the recalcitrant statement that I 4. 86 which is in the *Matritensis* was not in the codex excerpted by Politian. He sees clearly enough how idle it is to impeach the capacity of Politian. So, without advancing proof or corroboration of any kind, he denies his veracity. It is to be hoped that posterity will deal more gently with Mr. Garrod than he has dealt with the great Italian. Politian lied, he says, 'in order to strengthen his case' against the text of Domitius which he was correcting: lied in saying that the MS was 'uetustissimus' when he could see it was not a hundred years old, in saying that I 4. 86 was absent from the MS when it stood there in the text, and in saying that verse V. 5. 24-26 were 'intercisi' when the page on which they were written was uninjured.

And all this when there is a simple, if not quite obvious, solution at hand. Suppose that the *Matritensis* was copied from the *Vetus Poggii* while still untouched by emendation, and suppose that certain corrections, one of which was the erasure of I 4. 86, were imported into the MS by Poggio after he had recovered it from Niccolo, our difficulties will straightway disappear, and we shall be free to regard Politian as neither dishonest nor incompetent. As I have said before, it is unnecessary to assume that the line stood in the text of the *Vetus*. It may have stood in the margin or at the top or bottom of a page, with a note of omission, and have been transferred by the conscientious scribe of the *Matritensis*. And if Poggio subsequently erased it, the *deest uersus* of Politian was strictly correct.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool, January 1, 1913.

#### A NOTE ON LUCRETII V. 1010.

IN the MSS. this line is a foot short, and reads: 'nudant sollertius ipsi.' The most attractive emendation is that of Professor Palmer—'medici nunc dant sollertius usi'; but commentators appear to give this a wrong sense, missing the drift of the passage as a whole.

The argument is that in primitive times men did not die in much greater numbers than now. Then many died of want, while now luxury kills many. In those days men took poison in ignorance, whereas now physicians administer it more skilfully.

Mr. Duff, in his edition, plainly takes the last part to mean that now physicians use poisons more skilfully and so *save lives*. But doesn't this interpretation give a feeble ending to a very powerful passage? Lucretius is obviously writing in his most ironical vein. Then men died from poverty, whereas now they die of luxury; then they poisoned themselves unwittingly, now doctors poison them more *skilfully*. So it would seem to be a satire on the medical profession like those Epigrams in the Anthology. Then the *ipsi* of the MSS. might perhaps be kept, as this would make the change less violent.

Or is there a reference to the employment of doctors as *venefici*? In the *Pro Cluentio* Oppianicus's father is said to have tried to persuade his grandmother to see a certain doctor—'medicum illum suum iam cognitum et saepe victorem'—but she refused, because all her family had died under his hands.

This is in § 40; in § 47 poison is obtained again from another doctor, Cleophrantus. Possibly then the medical profession enjoyed an unenviable notoriety in the time of Lucretius.

Interpretation on these lines would give more point to the sentence, and make it a fit ending for a bitter diatribe on Civilisation.

A. J. RICHARDS.

Gwynfryn, Dynevor, nr. Neath.

## REVIEWS

## DER SCHOENE MENSCH: ALTERTUM.

*Der schoene Mensch: Altertum.* Von H. BULLE. Second edition. Text, pp. xxxiv + 740, with 210 illustrations; 320 plates. München: G. Hirth.

FEW more important works on Greek sculpture than this have appeared of late. Though called a second edition, it is really a new work, on a large scale, and arranged on somewhat novel principles. Of short histories of Greek sculpture, arranged in the usual chronological method, we have abundance, though only one (Professor E. Gardner's) in English. The present work, like those of Lange, von Mach, and others, proceeds on a different principle from the chronological, in order to approach Greek art from a fresh point of view. No one, I think, has anticipated Professor Bulle's special method. He works almost entirely from existing monuments, putting literary tradition in the background. And the extant monuments, of which he figures a very large selection, he arranges in series by subject.

After a brief preliminary survey of the art of Egypt, Babylon, and Crete, he reaches Greece at p. 65. (Roman art, by the bye, he regards as, from the point of view of the *Schoene Mensch*, negligible.) We begin with the standing male figure, next we pass to the leaning male figure and the figure in motion. Next comes the draped and then the nude female figure. Then we have a treatment of the seated and reclining form. Next children are considered; then heads, then relief-work, and finally drawing and painting. This plan seems at first confusing; in the plates we go constantly backward and forward in period: but any new point of view which is really helpful is welcome. I have found the work very full of suggestion.

As space is limited, I will mainly confine myself to a few features of the book, as to which I do not find myself in full agreement with Dr. Bulle: apart from these features I find little of which

I do not heartily approve. Both compact and learned, the book is quite a model of workmanship. The plates and other illustrations are refreshing in their unconventionality. Instead of the regular march past of familiar statues, we find here several eyes, there several knees, from different statues, put together for comparison. Sometimes we have a photograph of a living model in the pose of a well-known figure; sometimes even engravings of modern works of art for comparison. All this will be very stimulating to the advanced student.

However, to proceed to my oppugnations, I will observe, in the first place, that I am convinced that Dr. Bulle carries too far the recent tendency to carry back the dates of works of sculpture. The cowering youth from Subiaco he gives to the fifth century; the Nereid monument of the British Museum he attributes to the first half of that century. The tall and slender type of the draped (so called) Venus Genetrix (pl. 125) he gives to the latter part of the fifth century, the crouching Aphrodite Kallipygos, a work of characteristic Hellenistic tendency, to the latter part of the fourth century. This persistent early dating tends to throw the whole history of sculpture out of gear.

In the second place, I think that Dr. Bulle is imprudent in relying as much as he does on the exactness of copies of the Roman Age. Here of course he follows Furtwängler; but the path ends in a ditch. One almost wishes that Dr. Bulle had excluded from his plates all copies, and confined himself to originals. Then he would have had a safe basis: but it is quite impossible to tell what elements in the Roman copy of a Greek statue really belong to the work copied. As far as words go, Dr. Bulle allows this. He writes, (p. 440) 'the hand of the copyist alters and spoils the character of the original . . . therefore one must never refer a head to a particular sculptor on the ground of the treatment of the eye.' And on

the next page he observes that the existing copies of the Cassel Apollo, the Lemnian Athena and the Capitoline Amazon all differ considerably in the treatment of the eye, though he regards all of them as going back to Pheidian originals. Yet on the very next page he attributes statues (in Roman copies) to Cresilas on the ground of the similar treatment of the eye in all of them. This is the sort of confusion which necessarily arises when copies are taken too seriously. Of the nude youth by Stephanos Dr. Bulle observes (p. 88) that we have in it an unaltered copy of a bronze statue of about B.C. 470: surely it is rather a mannered and transposed copy. The Vatican statue of Apollo Sauroctonos is treated (p. 135) as an exact copy from the bronze of Praxiteles: but here we have several copies which differ very markedly in style, and the example of the Capitol is certainly not the most faithful among them. The truth is, as Dr. Bulle states in another place, that the character of *Copistenarbeit* is not worked out yet: and Furtwängler did immense and irreparable injury to the study of Greek art by assuming that copies of the Roman age were exact and trustworthy reproductions of Greek originals. In the great majority of cases where we have several copies of one early statue they differ one from another in important points.

As regards my third oppugnation, I must confess that Dr. Bulle would probably have the support of the majority of archaeologists. Yet his book itself shows him to be wrong. He carries out consistently the view which regards the Apoxyomenos of the Vatican as the type of the works of Lysippus; and by so doing is driven to give to Lysippus works which bear the full impress of the Hellenistic age. The Silenus nursing the infant Dionysus of the Vatican he declares (p. 136) to be Lysippic, disregarding the obviously allegorical character of the work, and its exaggeration of Praxitelean notions. The Herakles of Glycon (Hercules Farnese) he regards (p. 136) as a trustworthy copy of a bronze by Lysippus, and maintains that we cannot attribute to the neo-Attic sculptor Glycon any serious change of character in translat-

ing the original. The seated bronze Hermes of Herculeum he considers to come from the school of Lysippus, and perhaps to be by that master himself. Even the bronze wrestlers from Herculeum are put forth as originals by Lysippus, partly because the form of their ears is like that in the Apoxyomenos.

All this is very interesting. It shows the inevitable result of accepting the Apoxyomenos as the norm of Lysippus' work. Another corollary is to treat Lysippus not as the contemporary but as the successor of Praxiteles and Scopas, in defiance of chronology. And it involves an ante-dating by at least half a century of the most notable examples of third-century art. It was the great merit of Professor Lange of Copenhagen to make it clear that the naturalism and anatomical correctness, which come late into works of Greek sculpture, are the result of the anatomical studies of physicians such as Herophilus and Erasistratus of Alexandria, and belong to the period after B.C. 300. To this tendency belongs the Apoxyomenos, which stands at the head of a series going down to the fighter of Agasias in the Louvre, the one standing at the beginning, the other almost at the end, of a long development of Hellenistic art. But Dr. Bulle is driven to place 'the great change to decided naturalism' about the middle of the fourth century (p. 348), in the intensely ideal age of Praxiteles and of the early years of Alexander the Great, and so to put the whole history of art in the fourth and third centuries out of focus. He leaves little or nothing of originality to the period of the Nike of Samothrace, of the Tyche of Antioch, and of many of the finest portraits which exist, including the Demosthenes of Polyeuctus (B.C. 280). In fact, we may feel confident that but for the definite chronological evidence, Dr. Bulle would have found for all the works mentioned a period earlier than the age of the successors of Alexander. It is true that there has been a drift in his direction in archaeological theory of late; but it is an aberration, and archaeologists will have to retrace their steps.



As I have already said, I regard Dr. Bulle's work as in most respects deserving of high praise, and a most stimulating work to the student. If someone would produce a similar work dealing only with authenticated and

dated Greek originals, it would perhaps be still more valuable, if carried out with equal method and learning.

P. GARDNER.

105, Banbury Road, Oxford.

### PHILOSTRATUS.

*Philostratus in Honour of Apollonius of Tyana.* Translated by J. S. PHILLIMORE, Professor of Latin in the University of Glasgow. 2 vols. 8vo. Pp. cxxviii + 142-296. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 7s. net.

*Philostratus: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana. The Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius.* With an English Translation by F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A., late Fellow and Praelector of University College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. Pp. xlix + 592-624. London: William Heinemann; and New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912. 5s. net each volume.

It is just over 100 years since the life of Apollonius has last been made accessible to English readers, and it may seem at first sight a pity that two translations should now have appeared within a week of each other; but the scope and contents of the two works differ so considerably that both will be essential to the student of this curious figure of first-century religion. Such a student will be glad to possess, in Mr. Conybeare's edition, the *Epistles of Apollonius*, though they have hardly any claim to be genuine, and we could have desired a warning note from Mr. Conybeare to this effect; and the *Treatise of Eusebius*, directed against the comparison of Apollonius with Christ, is a necessary piece of material for the proper comprehension of the elaborate introductory arguments as to the object of Philostratus' work which Professor Phillimore has prefixed to his edition. These prefaces, on the other hand, form a most important and original piece of work, quite indispensable to the study both of the life and character of Apollonius and to the criticism of his biographer; and

they will be first considered in this notice.

Professor Phillimore, writing always in a lively and independent style, deals first with the object with which Philostratus wrote his book. He shows that the work is of the nature of a religious romance written with a definite object; and he justly comments on its exact title—*τὰ εἰς Ἀπολλώνιον*—which is not exactly rendered by Mr. Conybeare's *Life of Apollonius*. He goes on to consider the material that Philostratus used; how he rejected the writings of Moeragenes, which probably gave a true enough account of the prophet, but were hostile to the claims made on his behalf, and employed the papers of Damis, an ignorant and credulous admirer, put into his hands by the Empress Julia Domna, who was much interested in religious matters. His next investigation, into the identity of the various Philostrati, whose works have come down to us or who are known to have written, has less interest for the general reader: but it is of considerable importance to the student of the Imperial Greek writers, and is an example of close argument and clear exposition: they seem to have been a literary family of complicated relationship, each writing books of not dissimilar characteristics, which have naturally enough in later times been ascribed to a single author. As for *this* Philostratus, Professor Phillimore is able to give a very satisfactory account of his career, and his arguments as to the reasons which led him to undertake the task and the manner in which he carried it out will probably be accepted without much opposition. The rest of the introductory matter deals more directly with Apollonius himself: an ingenious and convincing

chronological argument puts his birth at some date more like 30 A.D., than that supported by Mr. Flinders Petrie, by which he would have been almost exactly a contemporary of Christ: he shows that Apollonius' reputation before Philostratus wrote was neither very widespread nor very high: and he discusses his fortune in religious circles after the publication of Philostratus' book; how he became part of the stock-in-trade of the anti-Christian writers, less of the academicals and Hellenists than of that portion of them imbued with Oriental ideas and of a turn of mind interested in magic.

Both translators have made use of Kayser's text in the Teubner series, and Mr. Conybeare prints it opposite his translation without variant. Professor Phillimore has introduced some valuable emendations of his own and of Mr. H. Richards and others. A specimen may be instructive. Apollonius is in India, when he receives a visit from a local King: a type of man of whom it might have been said, as of Trimalchio, that 'sestertium reliquit trecenties, nec unquam philosophum audivit.' After some preliminary banter of the Greeks (of course in the end the King is converted, admitting that he has been misled by the tales of rascally Egyptian visitors), he addresses Apollonius (Mr. Conybeare's translation): 'Welcome, goodly stranger.' But Apollonius answered: 'And my welcome to you also, O King, for you appear to have

only just arrived (ἐοικας γὰρ νῦν ἤκοντι).' The sense of this, however, is not satisfactory: the King had arrived five pages before, and in any case the remark would be a silly one. Professor Phillimore has surely successfully mended the text by reading νῦν ἔχοντι and translating 'for you seem to be a sensible person.'

Speaking generally, Professor Phillimore's seems more lively and idiomatic English, and his introduction and bibliography<sup>1</sup> makes the Oxford translation the more valuable piece of work: but, for the reasons mentioned above, and beyond all for the fact that Mr. Conybeare prints the complete Greek text, the latter's work must equally be obtained by all those interested in this curious by-product of Greek literature and religion.

S. GASELEE.

Magdalene College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Conybeare's edition does not seem to contain any bibliography, although such a provision is one of the aims of the Loeb Classics, of which this work forms two volumes: however, his first volume contains as frontispiece a handsome reproduction of a bust from the Capitoline Museum at Rome which is (doubtfully) supposed to be of Apollonius. Even in Professor Phillimore's book, where the bibliography is not unsatisfactory, there might have been some further mention of Charles Blount's translation and long notes on the first two books: it was said that 'this piece was published with the design to invalidate the testimony of the Evangelists concerning the miracles of our blessed Lord. A few copies only were dispersed before the work was suppressed.'

#### ARISTOTLE'S RESEARCHES IN NATURAL SCIENCE.

*Aristotle's Researches in Natural Science.*

By T. E. LONES. London: West, Newman, and Co. 6s. net.

DR. LONES' work is an instructive contribution to Aristotelian literature. Much erudition is brought to bear on the numerous questions discussed, and the author, besides utilising the results obtained by scholars and annotators, has made an attempt to check many of Aristotle's statements by personal observation or dissection. There are numerous references to literature, both

ancient and modern, appended in the form of foot-notes, but it is a little remarkable that Dr. Lones seems to have been unaware of the Oxford translations recently reviewed in these pages.

The introductory chapter treats of Aristotle's life and character, the order of his scientific works, and the influence of these upon men of science in subsequent ages. It is shown that this influence has at all times been considerable, and that even during the period of comparative neglect following

upon the attacks of Galileo, Bacon, and others, the interest taken in Aristotle's zoological treatises became greater than ever before, as is made manifest by a study of the works of Gesner, Ray, and Willughby. Dr. Lones gives an interesting list of words and phrases which owe their origin to Aristotle, and are still in common use in scientific writings. The second chapter describes Aristotle's method, which was the ascertainment of facts by exact observation and not by a process of deductive reasoning.

The remaining chapters deal with Aristotle's conceptions of the universe and the various natural phenomena described by him. The subject-matter of the *Auscultatio Naturalis*, the *De Caelo*, the *De Generatione et Corruptione*, and the *Meteorica* is treated of in two chapters, in which we learn something of Aristotle's speculations in regard to light and colour, heat and sound, the heavenly bodies, the air, the sea, and the face of the earth. These chapters also contain references to the *De Anima*, the *De Respiratione* and the *De Sensu et Sensibilibus*.

The remainder of the book is devoted to the study of Aristotle's work on living organisms, and there are interesting discussions on the distinctions between animals, plants, and inanimate matter and their respective constituents. In view of the recent controversy at the British Association regarding the origin of life, it is interesting to read the following extracts from Aristotle's writings: 'Thus nature passes by degrees from inanimate things to living beings, so that owing to their continuity the boundary between them escapes notice, and there is an intermediate common ground. For, first after the class of inanimate things comes the class of plants, and each of these differs from the rest in seeming to partake of life to a greater or less extent, and the whole class seems to be alive compared with other bodies, but lifeless compared with animals. The passage from them to animals is continuous, as I said before, for anyone

would be quite at a loss in deciding whether some marine forms of life are plants or animals, for they are attached to the sea-bed, and many of such forms of life die when they are removed from it.' And also: 'For nature passes in an unbroken manner from inanimate things to animals, through forms of life which are not animals, in such a way that one class seems to differ very little from another in the part where they border on each other.'

Next there is a chapter on plants, for although Aristotle's treatise *De Plantis* is generally considered to be spurious, it is possible to learn something of his botanical researches from various passages scattered throughout his works on natural history. In the following chapter there is an interesting list of animal species which Aristotle in all probability dissected. This is succeeded by an account of the so-called Homoeomeria, a term which corresponds roughly to tissues, and Anhomoeomeria, which are organs or parts having definite forms or functions. The occasional occurrence of solid-hoofed pigs is referred to, but the author omits to mention that the mule-footed hog is a well-known breed in America at the present day.

In the chapter on generation Dr. Lones states that Aristotle 'understood the purifying nature' of the catamenia. In commenting on this statement it is sufficient to say that the purifying nature of the process is not recognised by physiologists at the present day.

The work concludes with interesting chapters on Aristotle's classification of animals. These contain useful tables for identification of species.

The style of the book is dull, while the frequent reiteration of the words 'he says' is apt to be irritating. Nevertheless the work is one which can be safely recommended to those who wish to possess a concise account of Aristotle's researches in physical science and his views on natural phenomena.

F. H. A. MARSHALL.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

## GARROD'S SECOND BOOK OF MANILIUS.

*Manili Astronomicon Liber II.* Edidit  
H. W. GARROD. Pp. xcix + 166.  
Oxford University Press, 1911.

MR. GARROD has selected for treatment the hardest and dullest book of the *Astronomica*. It is the book in which, after the comparatively easy and interesting introduction to astronomy given in the first book, we suddenly plunge into the intricacies of astrology proper, to learn that Taurus is one of the 'feminine' signs, that signs which correspond to the angles of equilateral triangles, rectangles and hexagons inscribed in the circle of the Zodiac can influence each other, that signs otherwise situated may 'gaze at,' 'listen to' or 'love' one another by the rules of 'parallel association,' that besides the dodecatemory there exists the dodecatemory of the dodecatemory, and that our lives are affected by the cardinal points and the twelve regions of the Circle of Geniture. It was no easy task to write of these things in Latin verse, and it is no easy task to make intelligible to English readers the Latin verse in which they were ultimately written. Mr. Garrod has discharged it manfully. He has given us an excellent prose translation, thoroughly readable<sup>1</sup> and never really obscure. I say 'never really obscure,' because it was inevitable that in rendering such Latin at all closely he was bound to write some sentences that call for careful reading and hard thinking. What, for instance, can be done when your author chooses to represent an equilateral triangle inscribed in a circle by such words as these?

circulus extremo signorum ut clauditur orbe,  
in tris aequalis discurrit linea ductus  
inque uicem extremis iungit se finibus ipsa

(273-5.)

'At the last point in the Zodiac, where its course closes, the line of the Circle runs off into three equal straight

<sup>1</sup> At l. 246 surely the rendering of 'Aries in cornua tortus' as 'the Ram that twists his neck on to his horns' is due to some accident. The analogy of *irasci in cornua* (suggested in the note) might justify the translation 'that turns his head to butt with his horns.'

lines and joins itself to three points in the circumference which are each the furthest point possible from one another.' So our editor translates, and the sense is made clear by the note on 274: M.'s idea is that the circular line which forms the Zodiac suddenly becomes a straight one and proceeds to form in succession the sides of an equilateral triangle having its angles situated on the circle. Sometimes however the translation is itself a commentary as in ll. 216, 217 where the dreadful lines *cetera nec numero dissortia nec uice sedis | interiecta locis totidem nocturna feruntur* are most carefully rendered: 'The other signs, which are like the diurnal signs in that they are numerical pairs, and like them in that in position they are alternate pairs, fill the gaps left by the six diurnal signs, and are called nocturnal.' The commentary itself seems to me a model one, missing no difficulties and shedding light on everything with clearness and yet brevity.<sup>2</sup> The 'figures' are particularly useful, often revealing at a glance what a page of description might have failed to explain. If one could carp at anything, it would be at the frequency with which certain easy-going and inadequate editors of the *Astronomica* are censured. But the dullness of their task seems to compel editors of this poet to relieve themselves by fiery coruscations of this kind, and one who does his work as thoroughly as Mr. Garrod may well be allowed some license in this respect. I at least, as one who has tried to read the *Astronomica* with the help of the latest German commentary, cannot feel that anything said about the latter in this book is not well deserved.

<sup>2</sup> But I cannot accept the view expressed in the note on l. 255, that in *Ou. M. 3. 186 sqq. in latus obliquum tamen adstitit* means that Diana, when Actaeon surprised her, 'threw herself into a swimming posture, immersing herself and splashing water into Actaeon's face.' That the usual version 'stood sideways' is correct is made certain by *tamen*, which refers to the previous line, *quamquam comitum turba est stipata suorum*: although her nymphs crowded round to protect her nakedness, she instinctively turned aside.



Mr. Garrod has the gift of writing in an interesting way on matters textual, and has himself contributed over thirty emendations to the text which faces his version. Two-thirds of them come in the second half of the book. Some are rather bold, as e.g. in 619 (*creatus* for *trigono*) and 892 (*cingens fulcimina* for *contingent fulmina*). But the text of Manilius is admittedly a *πῆμα τομῶν* and in practically every case emendation of some kind is obviously necessary. I should have thought however that in 433 *sqq.* the punctuation '*his animaduversis rebus, quae proxima cura | noscere*, etc., 'the task that comes next is to learn . . .', would have rendered the change of *rebus* to *debes* unnecessary. Is such a construction too cramped for a poet who writes (444) *uenantem uirum sed partis equinae* for 'the huntsman that is half horse'?

The Introductions deal with the manuscripts, the composition and condition of the poem, and the editions. The claim of M. to be regarded as a member of the 'better family' is asserted, not without protest against certain misty sayings of Professor Housman's. As for the vexed question as to the date at which the poem was composed, Mr. Garrod suggests that books i and ii were written between A.D. 9 and A.D. 14, book iv. finished in A.D. 14-15. Surely, by the way, the lines 508 *sqq.* (*quid enim mirabatur ille—sc. Capricornus—| maius, in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum?*) are no proof that Augustus was living when they were written? The incomplete condition of the work is explained, not, I think, very plausibly, as due to the changed position of astrology after the edict of 16 A.D. 'That edict was directed against astrology as a practicable art. It was directed

against astrology in so far as astrology enables us to cast a horoscope. You can cast no horoscope if you do not allow for the *mixtura* of planets and signs in their influences. Consequently you cannot cast a horoscope by the aid of Manilius' poem as we possess it [the influence of the planets never getting full treatment in it]. . . . The sting of astrology is the planets. The *Astro-nomica* is astrology without its sting' (lxxii, lxxiii). The estimate of Manilius' literary powers is interesting and judicious.

I have made in the past more than one vain effort to understand this second book of Manilius, and I can appreciate the help given us by Mr. Garrod's work. It is a credit to English scholarship, and fills one with the desire that he should before long give us a text and translation of the whole work. There are a few slips and misprints. Thus, on p. xxiii (l. 16 from bottom) 110 should be 119, and on p. xxiv, after it has been made probable that fol. 44 v of the archetype of G L M ended with III 21, we are told that 'anyone who cares to make the calculation will find that fol. 47 recto must therefore have ended with III. 153.' But the archetype is assumed to have had 22 lines on a page: the extra 132 lines surely require six pages and bring us to fol. 47 verso. On p. 25 *Olympus* has become *Olmypus*; p. 33 (=l. 512) *sublimem* is translated 'huge'; p. 84 the note on 190 runs '*hominis*] *oris* codd.; and *oris* at 172 all save M.' But M. has *hominis* at 190 also; p. 107 l. 30 85 should be 65; p. 144 l. 14, I.M.C. should be O.C.C.; p. 149 l. 3 from the bottom, O.C.C. should be H.O.R.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

#### A NEW LATIN GRAMMAR.

*A New Latin Grammar.* By E. A. SONNENSCHN, D.Litt., Professor of Classics in the University of Birmingham. Pp. 266. Cr. 8vo. One vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 2s. 6d.

PROFESSOR SONNENSCHN'S *New Latin Grammar* is the first systematic attempt to apply to the teaching of Latin Grammar the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology. These recommendations,

designed to secure simplicity and uniformity in the teaching of grammar, aimed at framing some form of grammatical nomenclature which might be used in the teaching of all languages alike—a nomenclature sufficiently accurate to satisfy the classical grammarian, and sufficiently elastic to be applied to the looser structure of English and modern languages. Time and the experience of teachers, perhaps, alone can decide whether elasticity has been purchased at any loss of accuracy; whether the nomenclature based upon the individual eccentricities of Latin does not conduce to greater grasp and accuracy than a nomenclature framed with the eye upon the conditions of neighbouring and allied provinces. Those questions cannot be answered with complete confidence until the experiment to which the present grammar is the official introduction has had a fair and extended trial. But so much can be said with confidence—that a student of Latin who has mastered the grammar under review will have nothing to unlearn, and will have secured a grammatical point of view logical in itself, and fruitful of development over a wide field, which will not (to say the least) impede his initiation into the λόγοι ἐσωτερικοί which await the adept.

The accidence is, upon a principle now almost universally recognised in school grammars, as brief as is compatible with an adequate treatment of regular forms, all irregularities of declension, special forms and exceptions, being reserved so far as possible for an appendix, which includes also brief paragraphs on 'The Calendar,' 'Roman Money,' 'Abbreviations,' and an alphabetical list of Irregular Verbs. An admirable, and in many of its details an original, treatment of the principal parts of verbs has been adopted. On pp. 80 and 81 the formation of the Perfect Active of verbs of all conjugations is treated as exemplifying four general rules, and for the first time in a school grammar the almost uncharted ocean of the verbs of the third conjugation has been mapped out on a simple and easily intelligible principle.

In this part of the book one finds little to criticise. A note might have

been added on p. 100 dealing with the quantity of the *i* in *fio*; on p. 105 a note of warning might have been given with regard to the use of the form *faux* as the singular of *fauces*. On p. 109 a much more striking example than any Professor Sonnenschein has quoted with regard to the variation in quantity of the *i* in the Fut. Perf. Indic. and Perf. Subj. Active is to be found in Ovid *Epp. ex. P. iv. 5*, where we find *transieritis* (l. 6), *contigeritis* (l. 16) and *dixeritis* (l. 45), all Fut. Perf.

In matters of Syntax one naturally turns first to Professor Sonnenschein's pages on the Use of the Subjunctive (pp. 147-178), where the views expressed in his pamphlet, *The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive*, form the basis of the treatment. Before dealing with points which seem to call for criticism, one may be permitted to express one's sense of the immense gain in simplicity and clearness due to his method. Stress is constantly laid upon the fact that where the subjunctive is used, its use is not arbitrary, nor conditioned merely by the 'rule' that certain words 'take the subjunctive,' but due to the fact that the subjunctive has a definite meaning of its own, and because that meaning is required in the particular case. If a beginner once grasps the fact that the subjunctive in *hortatur ut populi Romani fidem sequantur* is the same use of the subjunctive as in *sequamur*; *placemus uentos et Gnosia regna petamus*, he will find nothing difficult or requiring special explanation in, e.g., *adessent* in such a sentence as *Tum . . . armati . . . ante solis occasum Martio in campo adessent; quibus aetas ad militandum gravior esset . . . cibaria coquere iussit* (Livy iii. 27, 3), by which most pupils taught upon an older system would be hopelessly stumped.

But one cannot help wishing that the theory had been carried out more thoroughly, though perhaps it was felt that the practical necessities of teaching should have first consideration. On pp. 148-161 we have the first (A) division of 'uses of the subjunctive mood,' viz., 'subjunctives denoting what is to be done,' including expressions of wish, desire, command (both in main and in subordinate clauses), 'postulative' sub-

junctives, etc. On pp. 162-168 we find the second (B) class of subjunctives, viz., those 'denoting what would happen under certain imagined conditions' or 'subjunctives of conditioned futurity.' Under class A full sentences like *uendat aedes uir bonus*, 'supposing an honest man to sell a house' (§ 342), while under class B is included the sentence *si uir bonus habeat hanc uim . . . hac ui non ulatur* (§ 350, 1). It is true that in § 343 (under A) we find the statement that 'postulative subjunctives are generally introduced by a subordinating conjunction, *si*, "if," etc.,' and readers are referred for the rules concerning the use of the tenses in such *if*-clauses to § 350 which comes under B; but the cross-reference only serves to bring out the fact that the dividing line between A and B breaks down in places. The fact is that the line should not be drawn at all, and conditional sentences should be treated as a subdivision of the use of the subjunctive denoting 'what is to be.' For instance in *Cic. N.D. i. 11, 26 si mentem istam quasi animal aliquod uoluit* [sc. *Anaxagoras*] *esse, erit aliquid interius er quo illud animal nominetur; quid autem interius mente? cingatur igitur corpore externo*, the verb *cingatur* is an instance of Professor Sonnenschein's class A; the use of the subjunctive expresses (logical) necessity. Is it anything more than a rearrangement or resetting of the same meaning to write *si mens ista animal sit, cingatur corpore externo* 'if it is to be [regarded as] a living creature,

it is to be [regarded as] surrounded by an external frame'? Treated thus, the conditional subjunctives would, one feels confident, become almost fascinating to both teacher and student. One does not, it need hardly be said, imply that there is any confusion in the author's mind, or that this view of the conditional sentences is to be regarded as opposed to his; but rather that in the present writer's opinion the arrangement adopted tends to obscure to the pupil what it is one of the objects of these paragraphs to make plain, the essential unity of all those uses of the subjunctive.

Under the heading of 'Subjunctives with Weakened Meaning' are classed (pp. 168-175) those uses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses in which the original meaning of the subjunctive seems to have been lost. One is not quite so sure that so characteristic a use of the subjunctive in Latin as that in dependent questions ought to come under this head; but as the usage cannot be said to have been yet satisfactorily explained, the point is quite properly left rather vague. Neither an elementary grammar nor a review of one is the place for discussing the question.

Professor Sonnenschein is to be congratulated heartily upon a book which marks so distinct an advance in the teaching of Latin Grammar.

R. M. HENRY.

Queen's University, Belfast.

#### JURISPRUDENTIAE ANTE-JUSTINIANAE RELIQUIAE.

*Jurisprudentiae Ante-Justinianae Reliquiae.* E. HUSCHKE. Sixth edition. By E. SECKEL and B. KUEBLER. Voluminis alterius Fasciculus Prior. 1 Vol. Pp. 188. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 2.20.

If the Barbarian conquerors of Rome were responsible for a considerable amount of ruthless destruction, posterity has nevertheless to thank them for the preservation of some important productions of the Roman genius. It is

primarily to the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, compiled by Alaric II. for the use of his Visigoth subjects in A.D. 506, that we owe such of the fragments of the jurist Julius Paulus as we possess at the present time. The *Sententiae* of Paulus, which constitutes five-sixths of this present volume, owes its preservation and especially its identification to the *Breviarium Alaricianum*, which is assisted in a subordinate degree by Justinian's *Digest* and other less important works. Huschke is of opinion that

though many of the titles were altered by the Visigoth monarch, Alaric made hardly any change in the form of the opinions of Paulus which he incorporated in the new code of Roman law that he compiled. His commission, indeed, was not to alter but to select. The text of the Visigothic code appeared in several old editions, but is best known in the *Collectio Juris Ante-Justiniani* published by Paul Krüger in 1878. The editor of that work took as his authorities the Paris MS. (a work of the eighth or ninth century known as L) and the *Codex Monacensis* (a manuscript dating from the sixth or seventh century and designated M). With these for the final selection of his text he compared the Berlin Manuscript (P). The present edition, which is an addition to the Teubner Texts, takes Krüger's work as its principal foundation, but adds some minor fragments of the works of Paulus, taken from his *Institutiones* his *Responsa* and other books, together with some short fragments of *Modestinus* and extracts from other unidentified works. It presents the reader with all that is extant of the leading jurist's work.

Julius Paulus, who is traditionally supposed to have been a native of Padua, possesses a somewhat obscure personality. He was a contemporary of Ulpian, with whom he acted as assessor to Papinian. Like his colleague he occupied the post of Praetorian Praefect, probably having been appointed to the position by Alexander in A.D. 222. His fame as an advocate at Rome was considerable and his reputation as a jurist hardly less great. He appears to have been exiled by Heliogabalus but recalled by his successor. The most famous of his works, the *Sententiae ad Filium*, was probably composed in exile. It was certainly not written earlier than the reign of Caracalla, inasmuch as it contains a reference to a constitution of that Emperor. For some time the high reputation of Paulus as a legal authority was obscured by the action of Constantine. Both Ulpian and Paulus had written annotations on the works of Papinian, the jurist *par excellence*, and

with the desire of preserving pure and intact the works of the master, Constantine decreed the invalidation of both the commentaries. As a result a stigma appears to have attached in the popular mind to all the works of Paulus,—a consummation, which was in no way sought by the imperial edict. In 327 Constantine undid the mischief so caused by officially recognising the excellence of all the writings of both Paulus and Ulpian, with the exception of the notes to Papinian, and attaching peculiarly brilliant commendation to the *Sententiae* of the former. 'Ideoque Sententiarum libros, plenissima luce et perfectissima elocutione et justissima juris ratione succinctos, in judiciis prolatos valere minime dubitatur.' The *Sententiae* in five books follows the order of the Praetorian Edict and consists of a series of opinions, quite shortly stated and without the citation of references or precedents. It is a parallel work with the longer *Opiniones* of Ulpian and deals in turn with all the phases of the edict,—the courts and procedure, dotes et tutelae, testamenta, fideicommissa and miscellaneous points of Law. It was the principal work on which the fame of Paulus rested, and established his reputation in the Western Empire. Possibly this geographical limit to his highest fame may have been in some degree due to his traditional birth at Padua, it being notable that the highest reputation of Ulpian, who was a native of Tyre, was current in the Eastern Empire.

The *Sententiae* may be regarded as the most important work on Roman jurisprudence prior to the era of Justinian, with the exception of the Institutes of Gaius. In the preparation of this useful edition, while Alaric's Epitome is the prime source followed, that authority receives much assistance and confirmation from such sources as the *Fragmenta Vaticana*, the *Collatio*, the *Consultatio*, and the *Digest* of Justinian. The work is well edited, with valuable prefaces, and is a useful contribution to scholarship.

J. S. BLAKE REED.

33, King Street, Manchester.



## SHORT NOTICES

ZANDER'S EURYTHMIA  
DEMOSTHENIS.

*Eurythmia vel Compositio Rhythmica Prosae Antiquae*: exposuit CAROLUS ZANDER. I. Eurythmia Demosthenis. Pp. xx + 494. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1910. M. 8.

THIS treatise is divided into seven chapters, headed as follows: I. De initio membri. II. Clausulae. III. De systemate. IV. Ad membra orationis rhythmica compositio refertur. V. De articulatione. VI. De distinctione. VII. De rhythmica recitatione. In the course of the work rhythmical analyses are given of the *Three Olynthiacs*, the *First Philippic* (parts), the *De Corona* (opening), and the *Leptines* (opening). Selected passages of Isocrates, and fragments of Thrasymachus and Gorgias, are submitted to the same anatomical process.

The author has discharged his task with great thoroughness, and has given full references to such primary authorities as Aristotle, Aristoxenus, Cicero, Demetrius, Dionysius, Longinus, and Quintilian. He maintains that he follows these authorities more faithfully than did Friedrich Blass. Certainly he does not carry system so far as to deny full play to those *μεταβολαὶ ἐναρμόνιοι* of which Dionysius speaks. But occasionally he is tempted, as most writers on this subject are, to slur syllables, and to divide sentences, in what seems an arbitrary way. The mechanical notation of longs and shorts is apt to bring with it too rigid a uniformity. The time-waves, the ebb and flow, of language refuse to be dominated thus by 'feet.' This is true even of verse, and still more true of prose. Demosthenes probably was more concerned, if he was governed by a conscious rule, to keep out metre than to bring in rhythm. Verse had for so long preceded artistic prose in Greece, and had passed on to it so large a store of well-shaped words and forms which fitted naturally into one or other of the many various metrical schemes, that the orator had to

beware of dropping unconsciously into the vicious sing-song of metre. Nevertheless, a certain amount of definite rhythm was convenient, as well as natural, at the beginning and the end of a sentence or a phrase. It corresponded to the rise and fall in the speaker's thoughts and utterance, and (when the words came to be written down) it served as a sort of punctuation: a fact of which the terms *period* (in the sense of *full stop*), *colon*, and *comma* still remind us. The sections on punctuation are among the best in Zander's book. It has lately been shown, as continental scholars may perhaps not be aware, that in the First Folio of Shakespeare the punctuation is what may be called *rhetorical*. Its main purpose is to guide the actor, in the delivery of his lines, by suggesting pauses of various length. Rhythmical and dramatic effect is the chief thing desired; not a strict logical or grammatical analysis of the sentence.

On p. vii. of his Preface, Zander gives a rather long list of passages in which S. H. Butcher, in his text of the *Olynthiacs*, has failed to record his deviations from the Paris manuscript (S). But it may be pointed out that the object of this most useful Oxford Series of Classical Texts would be defeated if minutiae found a place in the critical notes. The instances collected by Zander are of this trifling kind. They are, however, of some interest as tending to show that Demosthenes did not avoid hiatus (especially after a pause) so punctiliously as is sometimes thought, and also that he did not invariably shun the concurrence of three or more short syllables in succession.

W. R. R.

## SOME SCHOOL-BOOKS.

*Plain texts.* Teubner has published a *Florilegium Latinum* in two parts (60 pf. each), Drama and Narrative Prose, collected by the Philologische Vereinigung of the Königin Carola

Gymnasium in Leipzig. The Drama contains pieces from Plautus (30 pp.), Terence, and Seneca (30 pp.), with a few oddments. The Narrative contains pieces from Cicero (15 pp.), Vitruvius, Valerius Maximus (20 pp.), Seneca, Pliny (16 pp.), Gellius, Apuleius. The idea of cheap supplementary readers is excellent: but it is a pity to include texts which the pupils ought to have anyhow, like Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Pliny. We may also recommend Teubner's *Carmina Anacreontea* (M. 1.40 cloth), well printed; and a new enlarged edition of the useful *Epistulae Privatae Graecae* (M. 3.40 cloth). Mr. J. D. Duff's *Silva Latina* (Pitt Press, 2s.) is a Reader of an ordinary type, but it has all the long vowels marked (excepting long vowels in position). It may be useful to mention two Greek reading books from Tempsky (Vienna) and Freytag (Leipzig), *Lesebuch aus Platon und Aristoteles* (M. 3 cloth) and published separately, *Lesebuch aus Aristoteles* (M. 1.20 cloth). These extracts are arranged under subject headings.

*Norma Elegiaca*, by R. L. A. du Pontet (Clarendon Press, 1s. 6d.), is a book of Ovidian verse chosen for verse-writers to copy; its only fault is that it is too short. The same press publish a text of the *Pervigilium Veneris* at fourpence, and St. Jerome's New Testament in Latin (H. I. White, 2s. net), and an excellent Greek Testament at 3s. net, edited by Alexander Souter.

*Texts, with notes, simplified for schools.* Two more of the series *Clari Romani* have been issued: *Aemilius Paulus*, by F. R. Dale, and *Augustus*, by A. J. Spilsbury (Murray, 1s. 6d.). This is a useful and sensible series. Mr. G. M. Edwards adds to his school-books *Camillus*, containing a few dramatic stories from Livy (Pitt Press, 1s. 6d., with Vocabulary). A. J. Barnett condenses Sallust's *Catiline* into 30 small pages (Methuen, 1s.). Easier still is Sleeman's *Caesar in Britain* (same description), with long vowels marked, and exercises. Easiest of all are Bell's *Simplified Latin Classics*, by S. E. Winbolt (1s. 6d.), of which we have Vergil's *Taking of Troy*, and Vergil's *Athletic Sports*, rewritten in simple prose sentences with Latin questions. These are milk for babes. Similar

Greek milk, very thin, is supplied by W. D. Lowe in his *Wars of Greece and Persia* (Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d.).

*Texts Annotated.* Besides Mr. Spratt's *Thucydides V.*, which will be reviewed separately, the Pitt Press send us *Livy I.*, by H. J. Edwards (3s. 6d.), an excellent edition, and well printed; and the Clarendon Press *Isocrates Cyprian Orations* by E. S. Forster (3s. 6d.), of which the same may be said: but Isocrates is not an inspiring writer. Messrs. Weidmann continue to issue revised editions of their useful school-books: Classen's *Thucydides V.* revised by J. Steup (M. 3.20) and *Philoctetes* revised by L. Radermacher (M. 1.60).

*Helps.* Those who teach Latin Verse to the immature may find some useful hints in *Latin Elegiac Verse-Writing* by W. J. Helmsley and J. Aston (Blackie, 2s. 6d.), which contains 20 pp. of Ovid, Rules, Aids, Exercises, and Vocabulary. W. C. Wright's *Short History of Greek Literature*, from Homer to Julian (Pitman, 6s. net), is well written and readable, and it has good bibliographies; it also takes the history further down than is usual. Teachers may get much help from D. Bassi's *Mitologia Greca e Romana* (Firenze, Sansoni; 4 plates, 97 cuts), but being written in Italian the book will hardly be useful for schools. Johnston publishes a very cheap *Atlas of Ancient History* (2s. net), with 27 maps. A book of *Greek Sculpture* in large quarto (O. Schulze, 3s. 6d. net) contains 100 plates, well chosen, with letterpress by J. Warrack. This would make a good school prize, say for Athletic Sports.

W. H. D. R.

#### MEILLET: INTRODUCTION.

*Introduction à l'Étude comparative des Langues indo-européennes.* Par A. MEILLET. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged. 1 vol. 9" x 5½". Pp. xxvi + 502. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 79, Boulevard St. Germain. February, 1912. 10 fr.

THIS book is intended, as its title shows, for beginners. The most valuable chapter is the first, which is largely new. This gives a most lucid and

sensible summary of the main principles of linguistic science. Another useful chapter is that on vocabulary, which states the main results of such writers as Schrader, without however discussing their bearing. There is an interesting Appendix on the development of Comparative Philology, and a useful bibliography. The characteristic French gifts of lucidity and liveliness mark the book throughout.

The sketch of comparative grammar is limited in two ways. First, all attempts to explain the phenomena of the original Indo-European language are set aside as mere guesswork. So in the chapter on Ablaut the facts are given fully, but without any explanation. No doubt the accentual theory is only an unproved hypothesis. But there is some evidence for it: it illuminates the facts: it is widely accepted. Surely it deserves mention. Again, the sketch is strictly comparative, and does not deal with the history of any particular language. The classical student will find no account of the changes in the Latin vowels or the Latin verb, and very little about the Infinitive forms. For the beginner there is too little about Latin and Greek, too much about unknown tongues. Far too little is said about phonetics. For example, glides and sonant nasals and liquids are unexplained. The vowels *i* and *u*, consonantal *j* and *y*, liquids and nasals are all put together as sonants. Surely it would be simpler to take them separately first. Pure velars and palatals are not distinguished: the peculiar character of the former is ascribed to the influence of a succeeding *r* or *a*, or a preceding *s* or *u*. This may be so, but it cannot be proved till the combinations of *s*+palatal and palatal+*r* are explained. The treatment of labial velars in Latin and Greek is incomplete. M. Meillet regards the *-ei-* of *φῆρ-ει-ς* as the Indo-European 2 Sing. thematic suffix, and not as a Greek innovation. For the Acc. Sing. suffix he gives *n* as well as *m*. For the Dat. Sing. suffix he gives not *-ai* but *ei*. How then he would explain the Greek Infinitive in *-ai* he does not say.

The newly-found language Tokharian is included. The most interesting

point is the parallel it offers to the Latin Passive in *-r*.

The index is very poor.

LILIAN MARY BAGGE.

*Silvulae Academicæ.* Verses and Verse Translations by W. R. HARDIE, Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.

THIS is a very interesting collection. Every item in it stands for a difficulty overcome: if it is difficult to turn an epigram neatly, a scholar deserves credit also for the sustained effort which carries him through a long poem on the history of St. Andrew's, or a rendering of long passages from the *Lays of Ancient Rome*. As for merit, the work is Professor Hardie's; and the present reviewer is not going to assign marks to the various pieces, and say which deserves an Alpha, and which an Alpha *plus*.

These versions are not, properly speaking, *tours de force*. It is a great merit in Professor Hardie that, unlike many translators, he has been at pains to render in an appropriate way passages which, while difficult to reproduce, have nevertheless an affinity with something in Latin literature. The making of such version is really thus a form of literary criticism. For instance, there have been very meritorious attempts to turn highly modern passages from *Thyrsis* or *The Scholar Gipsy* into Latin hexameters. But the difference in thought and manner between Arnold and any Latin writer of hexameters, from Virgil to Claudian, is too great. There can be no real reproduction. Professor Hardie has seen that. He has chosen for the stanzas beginning 'He hearkens not! light cometh, he is flown!' the metre of the one Latin poem which is really a precursor of modern romanticism, the *Pervigilium Veneris*: the result is a genuine reproduction—something which is at least not altogether unlike Arnold—not a Virgilian Arnold who ceases to be Arnold the more he is made to resemble Virgil. And the metrical versions of prose passages show a like sense of what is appropriate. Even good examiners often set passages 'For Latin

Prose' which really do not bear a prose translation at all. Of course it is quite obvious—now that it has been done by Professor Hardie—that where Thackeray thinks like Horace he is best put into a Horatian dress. (It would be interesting to reverse the experiment and see what English verse could be put into Latin prose. But perhaps living originals might complain that this was going beyond the bounds of fair criticism.)

As one reads a collection like this, it is impossible not to regret the growing tendency among classical teachers to think less and less of composition in Latin and Greek. Surely it is the very way to recommend Latin and Greek to clever and cleverish boys who are not going to be 'serious students' or Professors and Researchers, but who when their critical intelligence has later developed itself will profit immensely by having been grounded in the classics. Such are pleased by the opportunity of making something for themselves: and of competing with others in the making of it, which is a stronger and an equally legitimate stimulus. They are babes in relation to the classics, and composition should be their milk. Instead, they are fed with *réchauffés* of literary criticism, which they are generally too young to understand, and only repeat by rote; or with highly unappetising scraps of what should be meat for such grown men as like it—a cold collation (before they can collate) of rival palaeographical and ethnological theories: the ingenious (and perhaps epoch-making) speculations of one Professor about the genesis of the *Iliad* and another about the origin of the Romans. Yet if cramming facts is a weary business, what about cramming theories?

A. D. G.

*A History of Greek Sculpture.* By RUFUS B. RICHARDSON. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 291. Illustrations, 132 (photographic process-blocks). New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co., 1911. \$1.50.

THIS is a brief summary—even briefer than it appears at first glance; for when the preliminary matter and illustrations

are allowed for, it contains barely 200 pages of text. It is evident that, in treating the subject on such a scale, either severe compression or selection must be practised. Prof. Richardson leans towards the method of compression; and in so doing he often includes rather too much—more than is easy to follow, or than is necessary for the appreciation of the main outlines. It is inevitable that any writer on such a subject should make use of the work of his predecessors; but the result in this case too often tends to give the effect of a mere compilation. A fuller and more direct description of fewer statues and reliefs would perhaps have been more helpful to the general reader and to the elementary student, for whom the book is apparently intended. Nor does the author himself escape some confusion, for instance when he says that 'the powerful torso sometimes identified with Hephaistos of the east gable (of the Parthenon) is really Poseidon of the west gable,' or that the Farnese Diadumenos is the best of all copies of the Polycleitan statue; without further comment or explanation, this last statement will bewilder a student with any sense of style. The numerous illustrations have the advantage of including several that are not too familiar.

E. A. GARDNER.

#### PAULY'S REAL-ENCYCLOPÄDIE DER CLASSISCHEN ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT.

*Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Neue Bearbeitung begonnen von G. WISSOWA . . . herausg. von W. KROLL. 14ter. Halbband. 1 vol. 10 x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Cols. 1473-2880. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1912.

THIS half-volume, completing the seventh volume, takes us from *Glykyrrhiza* to *Helikeia*. Among the longer articles may be mentioned *Gnosis*, *Gnostiker* by Bousset; *Γραμματεῖς* by Schulthess; *Grammatik* by Gudeman; *Gymnasium*, etc., by Jüthner; *Hamilkar*, *Hannibal*, *Hasdrubal* by Lenschau; *Haruspices* by Thulin; *Hekataios* by Jacoby. Omitting the usual compliments, which in the case of this great



work are almost an impertinence, we note the following small points. *Gongylos*: reference should have been made to J. P. Six's article in *Numism. Chron.* 1894 pp. 317 ff. *Gorgion*, dynast of Gambreium circa 399 B.C. (Xenophon, *Hellen.* III. i. 6; Head, *Hist. Num.*<sup>2</sup> p. 528) is omitted. *Gras* king of Idalium and *Gorgos* of Salamis in Cyprus are also omitted, although the latter is known from Herodotus. One of the most curious omissions is *Hadrianeia*, a city in Mysia distinct from *Hadrianoi pros Olympon*. *Haimilion* is another name that is wanting; though whether that is really a place-name may be doubted (see Babelon et Reinach, *Recueil général*, I. p. 26). The article on *Helene* does not take sufficient account of her relations with the Dioscuri in Asiatic cults (see for instance Perdrizet in *B.S.A.* iii. 163). Under *Gulussa* there is no mention of the decree from Delos in his honour (*J.H.S.* xi. p. 259). The Alexandrian form of sphinx with uræus tail should have been mentioned in the article *Gryps*; and the numismatic evidence on cock-fighting at festivals at Damascus in the article *Hahnenkämpfe* (there was something of the same sort at Neapolis in Samaria). The article on *Harpasa* by Büchner is an exception to the general rule that the numismatic evidence is not appreciated.

G. F. HILL.

#### NATURSAGEN.

*Natursagen: eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen Märchen Fabeln und Legenden*, herausgegeben von OTTO DÄHNHARDT. Bd. III. Tiersagen, Thiel I. und II. M. 8, cloth M. 10.50, each. Teubner, 1910 and 1912.

THIS is a very important work, as we have said in noticing the earlier volumes. There is a vast amount of matter in it, well arranged for use, and not to be found in convenient form elsewhere. The scope of the *Classical Review* does not admit of a detailed examination of its contents, but it is obvious to all who have followed the developments of late years, that the study of myth and legend in general is a necessary introduction to the study of Greek myth and

legend. There is not much that bears more closely on our subject. A legend from Malta describes how the Dolphin used to carry men on its back (225). Many curious things are told of the origin of fire and its guardians: all sorts of creatures have the credit of bringing it down. The nightingale is a transformed man, who ever laments for a lost friend (386) or lover (390), or she is a slandered wife who proclaims her innocence (400). Many other episodes recal the material of which classical myths are made: but there is no direct allusion to them, although there is occasional allusion to Christian saints or beliefs. But the world we here move in is that beast world in which fables grow up; and several of Aesop's are to be found. Some of the ancient fables dealt with are Hare and Tortoise, Hares and Frogs, Birds choosing a King, Bat and Cat, the Greedy Fox, the Wolf and the Ass, the Bees' Sting, King of the Frogs. This section is important for the history of the Beast Fable; in more than one case the author's combinations lead him to infer that the Greek form is the oldest.

W. H. D. R.

#### GREEK STORIES.

*The Sunset of the Heroes.* By W. M. L. HUTCHINSON. Illustrated by Herbert Cole. Dent.

*Greek Legends.* By M. A. Hamilton. Illustrated. Clarendon Press.

How happy are the children of to-day, sua si bona norint! Either of these books would have delighted certain children we could tell of, how many years ago! Miss Hamilton describes Theseus, Perseus, Heracles, the Argonauts, the Trojan War, and other such staple themes, in an unpretending style. Miss Hutchinson's book is more ambitious. She gives in a connected narrative the history of the Trojan War after the Iliad, and very well she does it. The pictures are delicate—too delicate perhaps in the modern fashion, but never mind: it is a delightful gift book, and its stories are not to be met with everywhere.

W. H. D. R.

*The New Laocoon*: An essay on the confusion of the arts. By IRVING BABBITT. Constable. 5s. net.

WE wish cordially to recommend this little book to those who care for literary criticism. So much sound sense, and such a merciless attack on sentiment and humbug, could not be found in many books. In discussing expression and form, Mr Babbitt shows how in the last three centuries 'the formal element has vanished away more and more, until nothing has been left but pure expression. We may note in passing that this is exactly what happened to the Cheshire Cat.' It would be difficult to describe the heresy more neatly.

*P. Vergili Maronis Opera Omnia ex recensione* HENRICI NETTLESHIP a IOANNE POSTGATE relecta. Tom. I. et II. Apud Macmillan et Socios et P. H. Lee-Warner, Mediceae Societatis Librarium. MDCCCXCII.

WE are really grateful to printer and publisher for these beautiful volumes: paper, ink and type are excellent. Even the margins are pleasing! I say even, for publishers and printers seem to have lost the eye for margins, and on their proportion depends half the pleasure and comfort of reading. How stupid the world is may be seen by a glance into 'large-paper editions'—too large or too small the margins must be, never right, and the four margins never proportioned. But this book has good margins. Perhaps there is a little of a dazzling effect with capitals (as on p. 11 or even 28-9); could they be made smaller? Others may not feel it so. Lovers of Virgil should not overlook the Medici Press.

W. H. D. R.

*Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*. By Sir J. E. SANDYS. Second edition. Pp. xcii+331. London: Macmillan, 1912. 12s. 6d.

THE *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* was first published by the British Museum in 1891

and Sir John Sandys' book appeared early in 1893. A new edition has now become necessary, and the indefatigable editor has presented it once more, thoroughly revised and to some extent enlarged. I observe no considerable continuous additions except in the Greek index, which has grown nearly a third as large again, not of course by the insertion of new words, but by fuller lexicographical treatment of the old ones. When many books come out with a very poor index or with none at all, it is a welcome thing that so much pains should have been given to work more useful to others than enjoyable to the man who does it. Such an index is a real addition to the scholar's resources. In the body of the book additions seem to have been made only by many small touches in all sorts of places. The Introduction has twelve more pages, the text and commentary about as many. The editor has kept a vigilant eye on the literature of his subject and very little can have escaped him. As he modestly claims that 'the present edition includes a probably complete conspectus of the numerous contributions' down to the present time, perhaps I may point out to him that he has quite pardonably overlooked a few to be found among the very various contents of my *Aristophanes and Others* (see Index). He now reads on his own conjecture in 47.13 τὰ μέταλλα . . . τὰ εἰς <δέκα> ἔτη πεπραμένα, and in 67.2 κλεψύδραι αὐλοῦς τε ἔχουσιν καὶ ἔκρουσιν. Since the great outburst of very necessary emendation when Dr. Kenyon's text was first published, no very important additions have been made, though small things have been done here and there. On the other hand the literature relating to or bearing upon the historical contents of the book has of course in twenty years grown to very large dimensions. The editor has not apparently changed in any way his position on the question of authorship: he still regards the book as Aristotelian, though possibly edited by a pupil. English opinion is, I fancy, not at all unanimous on this point.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

## NOTES AND NEWS

THANKS to the initiative of Dr. Leeper, Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne, a Classical Association was founded last October in Victoria with a constitution and objects similar to those of the English Classical Association. A veritable Classical Renaissance is taking place in Australia, which during the last few years has seen the rise of three vigorous Classical Associations. Under the capable guidance of Dr. Leeper, who has been elected its first President, the new Association cannot fail to prosper.

Professor Burrows, of Manchester University, has been appointed by the Prime Minister to be Principal of King's College, London. Professor Burrows's

quinquennium has been marked by a great development of higher classical work at Manchester, in particular by the first performance of Greek plays in Manchester: the *Frogs* in 1910 and the *Choephore* in 1912. It is interesting to note that governing authorities seem to show a preference for classical men in their administrative posts, as with the Principals of Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle, and Sheffield. Perhaps classics are 'really useful in my son's future career.' Side by side with this, we note a memorial to the Senate of Cambridge University, to inquire, amongst other things, 'whether, by retaining the classics as compulsory subjects, boys do receive that general education,' etc., etc. *Vires acquirit eundo.*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

\* \* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

- Apollonius Rhodius* (Argonautica) Edited by G. W. Mooney. Dublin University Series. 9" x 5½". Pp. vi + 456. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Baumgarten* (F.), *Poland* (F.), and *Wagner* (R.) Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur. Mit 440 Abbildungen im Text, 5 Bunten, 6 Einfarbigen Tafeln, 4 Karten und Plänen. 10" x 7". Pp. xvi + 674. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. Cloth, M. 12. 50.
- Blinkenberg* (C.) La Chronique du Temple Lindien. 9½" x 5¾". Pp. 317-457. Copenhagen: Bianco Luno, 1912.
- Botsford* (G. W. and L. S.) A Source Book of Ancient History. 7¾" x 5". Pp. x + 594. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.
- Bowers Taylor* (W. S.) Brief Outline of the Teachings of the Higher Grecian Wisdom. 5¾" x 4¾". Pp. 12. London: Lund Humphries and Co., 1913. 3d.
- British Association Report* (On the Influence of School-Books upon Eyesight). 8½" x 5½". Pp. 34. London: Offices of the Association, 1912. 4d. per single copy; 250 copies, £2 5s.; 1,000, £5.
- Feyerabend* (K.) Pocket Latin-English Dictionary. 6" x 4". Pp. xvi + 407. London: H. Grevel and Co., 1912. Cloth, 2s. net.
- Field* (G. C.) Socrates and Plato. A Criticism of Professor A. E. Taylor's *Varia Socratica*. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 40. Oxford: Parker and Co., 1913. 2s. net.
- Friedeberg* (S.) Joshua: an annotated Hebrew text. 7¾" x 5". Pp. 245. London: Heinemann, 1913. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Friedländer* (L.) Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire. Translated by A. B. Gough. Vol. IV., Appendices and Notes. 8" x 5". Pp. viii + 718. London: Geo. Routledge and Sons, 1913. 10s.
- Grenier* (A.) Étude sur la formation et l'emploi des Composés Nominaux dans le Latin archaïque. 10" x 6½". Pp. 224. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1912. Fr. 8.
- Halliday* (W. R.) Greek Divination. 8" x 5". Pp. xvi + 309. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913. Cloth, 5s. net.
- L'Anabase de Xénophon* (Retraite des Dix Mille) avec un Commentaire Historique et Militaire: avec 48 cartes, etc., par Colonel Arthur Boucher. 11" x 9". Pp. vi + 406. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1913. Fr. 25.
- Le Avventura di Cherea e Calliroe*. Romanzo tradotto de Aristide Calderini (Il Pensiero Greco, Vol. VIII.). 8½" x 5½". Pp. 424. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1913. L. 8.

- Loeb Classical Library.* Appian's Roman History (H. White), Vol. II., pp. 477. Lucian, (A. M. Harmon) Vol. I., pp. xii+471. Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris (F. W. Cornish, J. P. Postgate, and J. W. Mackail), pp. xii+377. Euripides (A. S. Way), Vols. III. and IV., pp. xvi+660 and xvi+507. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". London: W. Heinemann, 1912. Cloth, 5s. net per vol.
- Lucas* (Sir C. P.) Greater Rome and Greater Britain. 9" $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 184. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Müller* (Iwan von) Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur, bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. Achter Band. Zweiter Teil, 2 Hälfte, 3 Auflage. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xiv+601. Munich: C. H. Beck. 1913. M. 10.
- Perse Latin Plays*, by W. H. S. Jones and R. B. Appleton. 7" $\times$ 5". Pp. 67. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Robins* (E.) Where are you going to . . . ? 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. vi+312. London: Heinemann, 1913. Cloth, 6s.
- Sappho und Simonides.* Untersuchungen über Griechische Lyriker, von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 330. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 9.
- Schneider* (R.) Griechische Poliorketiker. Mit den handschriftlichen Bildern herausgegeben und übersetzt. III. Mit 7 Tafeln. 11" $\times$ 9". Pp. viii+87. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 8.
- Stark* (A. R.) The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers (Dissertation for Doctorate of Philosophy). 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+60. Chicago: University Press.
- Teubner's Texts.* Libanii Opera (R. Foerster), Vol. VII. Declamations XXXI.-LI., pp. xvi+739, M. 15. C. Valerii Flacci Argonauticon Libri Octo (O. Kramer), pp. lxxxvi+218, M. 3.20. Archimedis Opera Omnia (J. L. Heiberg), Vol. II., pp. xviii+554. 7" $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- The Syrian Goddess.* A translation of *De Dea Syria*, with a Life of Lucian, by H. A. Strong and J. Garstang. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. xiv+111. London: Constable and Co., 1913. Cloth, 4s. net.
- Usener* (H.) Kleine Schriften IVter Band. Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+516. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 15.
- Wecklein* (N.) Ausführlicher Kommentar zu Sophokles Philoktet. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. vi+82. München: J. Lindauer, 1913. M. 1.60.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff* (U. v.) Reden und Vorträge. Dritte, vermehrte Auflage. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. viii+416. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. Cloth, M. 10.
- Yeld* (G.) A First Virgil. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vii+116. London: Blackie and Son, 1912. Cloth, 1s. 9d.

---

ERRATUM.—In the February number the entry *Von Sphettos* (A.) should have been *Dittmar* (H.) Aischines von Sphettos.